



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 2013

No. 123

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAMALFA).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

September 18, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DOUG LAMALFA to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

ALZHEIMER'S MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to discuss the sixth-leading cause of death in the United States of America and the fifth-leading cause of death for those aged 65 years and older. It's a disease more than 5 million Americans are living with and is the only cause of death among the top 10 in the United States without a way to cure it or to slow its progression. It's a type of dementia

that encompasses various diseases and conditions that damage brain cells—Alzheimer's disease.

September is Alzheimer's Month, a time spent by Alzheimer's advocates in promoting and educating on this life-changing disease.

According to the Alzheimer's Association, deaths from Alzheimer's increased close to 70 percent between 2000 and 2010. During that same time period, deaths from other major diseases, such as heart disease, decreased. In my home State of Pennsylvania, in 2010, more than 3,500 individuals died from Alzheimer's. My mom, Mary Thompson, suffered with Alzheimer's for 10 years as the disease slowly stole her memories, her dignity and, eventually, her life.

In 2010, Congress passed legislation to create a national plan to combat Alzheimer's disease. It established a National Alzheimer's Project within the Department of Health and Human Services in order to coordinate the country's approach to research and caregiving. This effort supports the amazing work being done through medical research and awareness to improve the lives of those who are living with Alzheimer's.

While awareness of Alzheimer's has grown over the last decade, America and the world have a long way to go to educate and combat this disease. Alzheimer's is a condition that most Americans have encountered through a parent, a loved one, a friend or someone close they care about. However, together, through continued advocacy, research and the dedicated work of health professionals, care providers and scientific researchers, we can and will make a difference.

END HUNGER NOW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, week after week, I've stood on this floor and talked about hunger in America. Week after week, I've talked about the devastating impacts of hunger in our country—how it affects kids and seniors and how our country is worse off because of hunger. I've talked about ways we can end hunger, and have expressed my commitment to the effort to end hunger now.

The problem, Mr. Speaker, is that the Republican leadership not only willfully ignores the plight of the hungry in America, but they are actually moving legislation that will make hunger in America worse.

Just a few weeks ago, USDA released the newest data on hunger in America. Hunger rates have essentially stayed flat over the past few years. That means that, statistically, hunger hasn't gotten worse since the end of the Great Recession, but it hasn't gotten any better either.

The United States has a strong anti-hunger safety net. Even though we have 49 million people who don't know where their next meals will come from, we know that nearly 48 million of them are enrolled in SNAP, formerly known as "food stamps." SNAP is a lifeline. It provides low-income families with access to food, access they wouldn't otherwise have if they were not enrolled in SNAP. Now let me address a common piece of misinformation, a fabrication, that opponents of SNAP continue to use again and again.

SNAP is among the most effective and efficient, if not the most effective and efficient, Federal program in America. SNAP error rates—overpayments, underpayments and fraud rates—are not only at all-time lows for the program, but they are among the lowest rates of any Federal program. This notion that fraud, waste and abuse are rampant in SNAP is a fallacy. It's a make-believe talking point designed to take away food from hungry people. Yet the Republicans are

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H5591

bringing a bill to the floor tomorrow that, if passed, will undoubtedly make hunger worse in this country. Their bill will make hunger worse for working mothers and fathers, for kids, for senior citizens, and even for our veterans.

CBO reports that the bill would cut 3.8 million low-income people from SNAP in 2014—and just so there is no misunderstanding, “low-income” means “poor.” On top of that, an average of nearly 3 million people will be cut from SNAP each and every year over the coming decade. These are some of the Nation’s most destitute adults as well as many low-income children, seniors and families that work for low wages. That’s right. People who work but who don’t make enough to feed their families will be cut from this program.

The biggest cut affects at least 1.7 million unemployed, childless adults in 2014 who live in areas of high unemployment. These are poor people. Many don’t have the skills or education they need to find a job. This is a group whose average income is about \$2,500 a year for a single individual—\$2,500 a year—and for most, SNAP is the only government assistance they receive.

This bill also cuts an additional 2.1 million people from SNAP in 2014, mostly low-income working families and low-income seniors. These are people who have gross incomes or assets modestly above the Federal SNAP limits but whose disposable incomes—the income that a family actually has available to spend on food and other needs—are below the poverty line, in most cases often because of high rent or child care costs.

If that weren’t bad enough, 210,000 children in those families would also lose their free school meals, and 170,000 unemployed veterans will lose their SNAP benefits. To top it all off, other poor, unemployed parents who want to work but who cannot find a job or an opening in a training program, along with their children other than infants, will be cut from the program.

Mr. Speaker, I remember when combating hunger was a bipartisan issue—when Bob Dole worked with George McGovern and when Bill Emerson worked with Tony Hall. It didn’t matter whether you were a liberal or a conservative—ending hunger was a priority. The current Republican leadership has blown all that up.

We should not do this. There are no hearings on this bill, no markup, no semblance of regular order. And for what—to stick it to the working poor yet again? We should be doing everything we can to end hunger now. The Republican bill just makes hunger worse, and it should be soundly defeated.

Mr. Speaker, I urge and I plead with both Democrats and Republicans to stand together, to come together in a bipartisan way, and to demand to end hunger now.

Please, please, my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, reject this Repub-

lican leadership bill that is coming to the floor tomorrow. It is cruel. It is immoral. We are much better than this. Reject the leadership bill.

END HUNGER NOW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) for 5 minutes.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, although this hall is empty, there are a lot of people watching it, and I wonder how many of them have ever actually gone hungry. How many of the people watching this have had to go without a meal so their kids could eat? How many have had to wonder how they’ll get through a summer without subsidized school lunches? It’s easy to talk about pulling yourself up by your bootstraps when you’ve had designer shoes on your whole life.

Tomorrow, we will be voting on whether or not to cut \$40 billion from SNAP. That’s a nutrition program for people who do not have access to adequate nutrition. It’s a program that helps one out of seven Americans to put food on the table. If this seems familiar, it’s because it is familiar. Republicans tried just exactly this before the August recess, a couple of months ago, and not surprisingly, for the most unproductive Congress in decades, this bill had to be pulled at the last minute because of a lack of support. Even some of the Republicans saw it was too much.

Anyone who has been paying attention knows that symbolic votes to nowhere are the bread and butter for this Congress, but the Republicans couldn’t even get their own support on the bill—\$20 billion of cuts that primarily help children and the elderly wasn’t enough for them. They had to hurt people more, so here we are again with a new, improved plan that doubles the cuts to \$40 billion. On top of making 2 million people ineligible for benefits, they are also going to take away our States’ ability to provide temporary benefits in times of high unemployment. As a result, the CBO predicts that this will add an additional 1.8 million hungry Americans to the “ineligible” list.

Why are we attempting to inflict another needless wound on the working poor?

Republicans will tell you that the program has grown too much over the last few years, as though the need for food stamps were unrelated to a dragging economy. They see no connection between the economy and the fact that people don’t have food. That’s exactly what the program was designed to do—quickly help people who are in need. When unemployment is high and people can’t pay their bills, that’s exactly the time they need the SNAP program. Caseloads rose dramatically when the recession hit. We laid off 700,000 people a month in 2007, but that growth has also slowed as the economy has recovered slowly. The CBO projects that, in

just a few years, SNAP spending will be back down to 1995 levels as a share of the GDP, and since it’s shrinking on its own, it isn’t adding to the long-term deficit problems.

The rhetoric is simply empty and stupid. Conservatives can try and push this tired welfare abuse narrative. It’s a talking point. Every time they come out here, “Welfare abuse. Welfare abuse. People are getting money for food. That’s welfare abuse,” but as usual, the reality is not in their corner. Studies show that food assistance has some of the lowest rates of fraud of any benefit program. If you go to one of those food banks and talk to the people who are there, you’ll find some surprising people there, people who thought they would never have to go there, but they are short on money and can’t feed their kids, so they’re getting some money.

So I ask you again: Why are we doing this—wasting time to satisfy the furthest right-wing of the Republican Party?

We are again catering to a fringe agenda thought up by partisans who are obsessed with the deficit bogeyman. That bogeyman has been roaming around here for 4 years. “We’re going to have a terrible collapse. We’re going to have inflation. We’re going to have terrible things.” It has never happened. The President has done a miraculous job in keeping us on an upward track in spite of the resistance of the other side. What it does is it makes it harder for 4 million people to put food on the table.

So be it. That’s their attitude. I’m in. At least they won’t risk facing a primary in the next election. They are all worried about somebody further on the right. We’ve already got one Member over here, Mr. Speaker, who is worried about somebody coming from the right, and he’s about the furthest right I can imagine on the floor.

Senate Democrats and Republicans appointed conferees to negotiate a farm bill back at the beginning of August. Quit worrying about scoring points with the Heritage Foundation, and let’s focus on the American family and vote this bill down.

□ 1015

SNAP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I think each one of us 435 has to ask ourselves, Is this really what we were sent here to do, to take food out of the mouths of hungry people, nearly half of them children? That’s what’s at stake this week when we are asked to vote on legislation that would cut \$39 billion from one of our Nation’s most successful and important programs, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, SNAP. It used to be called food stamps.

As a Jew, we just came through the Jewish holidays, and we talked about what it means to be a human being in this world, in this country. Every major religion in this world and represented in this House teaches that you feed the hungry. Not as charity, but as a mandate, because that's what it is to be a human being in our world. All the religions have written letters and implored us not to do this.

I participated three times in the congressional food stamp challenge in which we eat on \$31.50 for an entire week. I'm not complaining about it because I knew it was just a week and it would end, but that's the average SNAP benefit. You know what? You can get the calories. That's pretty easy if you're lucky enough to live near a grocery store and not in a food desert. The reality for 48 million people is that you can get the calories, but it's really hard to get the nutrition. By the time you get to the fruits and vegetables, which are quite expensive, it's hard to do it. It's not comfortable to rely on SNAP benefits, and many people line up at the end of the month at food pantries that are everywhere in this country, including some of the richest districts. But the SNAP program, which has a bipartisan history, is the last line of defense between 48 million Americans and chronic hunger.

The House already voted down a farm bill that included \$20 billion in SNAP cuts, and it would have taken benefits away from up to a million children and would have prevented 200,000 hungry children from getting the school lunches that they rely on so much. Now this bill is back but on steroids. In addition to all of the devastating cuts that have been proposed, those that were rejected earlier, the new bill would prevent any able-bodied adult from getting more than 3 months of SNAP benefits during a 3-year period, even if they're unable to find work. Up to 170,000 of those who are veterans who served our country would be denied. This is at a time when unemployment among low-income Americans is over 20 percent and the average time of unemployment is about 9 months. Those numbers don't add up. It means that passage of this bill could nearly starve those looking for work, and no one can deny that fact.

I know how SNAP benefits my constituents, and I know what would happen if those benefits were lost. I've attended several events at food pantries and community centers, and each time I've heard resounding support for SNAP. In just one day, I received 242 postcards from my constituents urging me to oppose these dangerous cuts to the SNAP program. They have my vote, and I'm imploring my colleagues that it should have the vote of every Member of this body to reject those cuts.

A constituent who previously wrote to my office summed up her thoughts about the importance of funding the SNAP program this way. Here's what she said:

Hungry thoughts every waking day are my constant companion here in the supposedly wealthiest country on Earth. Please have compassion for your low-income and fixed-income constituents who are loyal, patriotic Americans and who are in dire need of nutritious and affordable food.

A former SNAP beneficiary, a woman named Dresden Shumaker, described the program as a trampoline rather than a safety net. Because of SNAP, she was able to make ends meet for her young family during a period of time of great need. Her story is similar to most SNAP beneficiaries who no longer need food assistance within one year of receiving benefits.

I'm begging my colleagues, please, don't support these cuts. Let's be the value-driven country that we are and vote "no" to the \$40 billion cut to SNAP.

SNAP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the ongoing Republican war on the poor—and that's what this is—and their attempt to gut our Nation's critical safety net against hunger one more time.

This past June, the Republican leadership failed millions of farmers and millions of struggling families when they could not pass a farm bill. They allowed the extremist Tea Party fringe of their party to poison the farm bill with amendments and so-called reforms that, in fact, would only increase hardship and hunger in America.

Yet instead of working across the aisle to find a better solution that would create jobs and protect families, the Republican leadership has chosen to bring an even more hurtful, toxic, and heartless nutrition bill to the floor. This new bill includes all of the extremist amendments that killed the first farm bill. It also piles on even more restrictions and so-called reforms that only serve to increase hardship for hungry families, children, seniors, and veterans.

These false reforms will dramatically reduce access to vital nutrition assistance all across America—rural and urban—in every single one of our congressional districts.

This bill would also end critical flexibilities for our States and would cripple smart and targeted programs that allow States to efficiently deliver nutrition assistance to the neediest. For example, the Republican nutrition-only bill would end categorical eligibility for all of our States.

We created this to streamline the delivery of social services so that we can lower administrative costs and put more of these dollars directly into the hands of needy families. This Republican bill would end those efficiencies, raise costs for our States, and make it harder for families to get the help they need.

This bill also claims to create work requirements for able-bodied adults. Let me remind my colleagues that the SNAP program already has very restrictive work requirements. The current SNAP program cuts off able-bodied adults after just 3 months of benefits right now. We only allow States to adopt waivers for when unemployment in their States rises high enough that this restriction is clearly unreasonable. The new so-called "reforms" would cut everybody off, no matter what the unemployment rate is in their State. This is just heartless. These cuts would come at a time when the Republicans have blocked every single effort to pass a real jobs bill in the House and cut job-training and job-placement assistance. Let me tell you, as a former food stamp recipient myself, I know that people don't want to be on food stamps. They want to work. If we're going to put work requirements on people, why in the world don't we pass a jobs bill so they can work?

At a time when our Nation should be creating opportunities for all, the House Republican leadership proposed to cut SNAP by \$40 billion. This will surely create a bleaker future for our children, our seniors, and our overall economy. If this bill ever becomes law—and I hope it doesn't—at least 4 million to 6 million low-income children, seniors, and families will be cut from this economic lifeline and pushed into poverty.

Similar to about 29 of my colleagues, I have taken the food stamp challenge about three times and ate off of \$4.50 a day. It was unhealthy and very difficult; yet I knew it would only last a week for me. Yet millions of Americans see no end in sight. And now, mind you, they have to worry that this meager benefit, this pittance, is going to be cut even more.

Instead of gutting SNAP, we need to strengthen it. Not only does SNAP help put food on the table for struggling families; it also helps stimulate economic growth. For every \$1 in SNAP benefits, we generate \$1.70 in economic activity. So Congressman CONYERS and I have introduced new legislation that would extend the SNAP benefits that were increased as a part of the stimulus package. Otherwise—and many don't know this—on November 1, every single family or individual who receives SNAP benefits now will see an automatic cut of about \$29 per month for a family of three. This will happen regardless of this \$40 billion nutrition cut.

In 2011, SNAP lifted 4.7 million Americans out of poverty. Without SNAP, millions more would fall into poverty, millions more of Americans would suffer hunger, and our economy would create even fewer jobs and be worse off.

I just have to say, our values as Americans and who we are as a country recognize that these despicable cuts are immoral and un-American. We need to provide opportunities to help lift families out of poverty, grow the economy, and create economic stability for

all. Let's restore a unified farm bill, and let's put an end to these draconian cuts to SNAP.

SNAP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VEASEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, there's a cruel war being waged on the poor and hungry in America. I stand today as a voice for more than 1.6 million Texas households who depend on SNAP. Cuts to SNAP, our Nation's first line of defense against hunger, are immoral. I will not stand by as my Republican colleagues continue to balance the budget on the backs of the most vulnerable Americans.

House Republicans unveiled on Monday a plan to cut over \$40 billion in SNAP over the next 10 years. This proposed package would eliminate basic food assistance for over 4 million Americans, including poor jobless adults in areas of high unemployment, working-poor families, children, seniors, and even struggling veterans.

Some might say that the proposal is an attempt to reduce fraud or waste in the program. Some say benefits are going to adults who don't want to work. I have news for people who say that: you try earning minimum wage, working hard every day, and you will still, after working 40 hours a week at the end of the year, only make around \$15,000.

All of these claims are misleading to the public. SNAP fraud has been reduced to about 1 cent per dollar spent on the program, according to one of the most recent USDA statistics. In fact, the cuts will come from benefits that many Americans need to survive. These cuts will take food out of our seniors' refrigerators and food out of the mouths of our babies. This new legislation unfairly targets millions of unemployed adults who want to find work; but due to a bad economy and a sluggish recovery, they cannot find a job.

□ 1030

This includes Republicans, too. I worked at a grocery store in Texas when I was in high school. And I saw Republicans come in from Republican strongholds, like Weatherford, Texas, Azle, Lake Worth, and they were on SNAP.

People need to stop stereotyping the program. Proponents claim that these cuts represent "work requirements," but that is willfully misleading, Mr. Speaker. The provisions would callously terminate food aid to people who are willing to work but just can't find a job.

Just a few short weeks ago, the Republican leadership of this House tried to eliminate the SNAP benefits entirely when they stripped the nutrition program from the farm bill. This is a cruel assault against the most vulnerable and neediest Americans. Those af-

ected by the bill's harshest provisions even include low-income veterans, putting food assistance at risk for an estimated 170,000 of the approximately 900,000 veterans who receive SNAP benefits.

Mr. Speaker, I also participated in the SNAP challenge this year and lived on a budget of \$4.50 a day and can attest that it was not easy. I had to make tough decisions and realized firsthand how difficult it is to follow a healthy diet on such a limited budget. I made difficult choices, as families do every day, between purchasing nutritious options and what's on sale. As a father of a 7-year-old son, I cannot imagine the decisions many Texans have to make every day, including skipping a meal to provide nutrition for their kids.

When drafting this legislation, did anyone take the time to think about how these SNAP cuts would hurt our kids? Nearly half of all SNAP participants are kids. This represents close to one in three children in the United States. Without access to nutritious meals, our children are put at risk of developmental delays, poorer physical health, and many other ailments.

Mr. Speaker, we need to do everything that we can to keep the SNAP program going. The conditions that I have talked about are very serious when you think about it affecting a child's ability to learn and perform well in school. These long-range implications have dire consequences for our entire economy.

I ask my friends on the other side of the aisle who support these cuts, these kids that I just talked about, what did these kids do to deserve these cuts?

This past year, some 49 million Americans lacked access to adequate food because they didn't have enough money or other resources to meet their basic food needs. Many of these hungry Americans skipped meals or took other steps to reduce what they ate to make ends meet.

I represent a constituent in my district who is elderly, disabled, and lives on a fixed income. She received \$93 a month in SNAP benefits, but recently, those were cut to only \$52 a month. That's only \$1.73 a day. And if this bill is passed, she will be cut off from the program entirely. I ask the proponents of this program, where is she to find assistance for her nutrition needs? I refuse to stand silent as some propose we take food out of the mouths of the hungry.

SNAP is also a very powerful anti-poverty program that has helped make our economy stronger. In 2011, SNAP kept 4.7 million people out of poverty, including 2.1 million children.

SAFE CLIMATE CAUCUS AND HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, it's time for Congress to

work together on a commonsense solution to address the impacts of climate change.

As we begin Hispanic Heritage Month, it's important for us to recognize the impact climate change is disproportionately having upon minority communities across the country. Whether it's farmers and ranchers in my home State of New Mexico struggling through devastating drought conditions or communities that are being impacted by recent flooding as a result of more severe weather, millions of Americans have been impacted by the effects of climate change.

Released earlier this year, a survey conducted by Public Policy Polling found 74 percent of Latinos believe climate change is a serious or a very serious problem, a higher level than the 65 percent among all American adults; 68 percent of Latinos support the President using his authority to reduce greenhouse gas pollution, including 60 percent of all American adults; 69 percent of Latinos agree with the President's statement that "for the sake of our children" and our future, we must do more to combat climate change, compared to 62 percent of all American adults.

Combating climate change and preserving our land, water, and air is a top priority for many Americans, especially those in minority communities. For years, a coalition of stakeholders, including Hispanic farmers and ranchers, tribal communities, conservation groups, hunting and fishing organizations, and local governments came together to lay the foundation that led to President Obama establishing the Rio Grande del Norte National Monument earlier this year. This is an example of the type of leadership and advocacy that can make a real difference in addressing climate change and preserving our precious resources. By establishing the Rio Grande del Norte, we have created economic certainty for farmers and ranchers, increased recreation and tourism opportunities, and, most importantly, protected our land, water, and air for future generations.

Mr. Speaker, I have also come to the floor today to express my concern for the House Republicans' plan to slash funding for the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program. This program is vital to many in New Mexico, especially our children. Sadly, New Mexico ranks near the bottom when it comes to childhood well-being and ranked worst in childhood hunger.

The Republican plan to cut \$40 billion from the SNAP program caters to the most extreme views. Earlier this year, they tried to cut \$20 billion, only to have the Tea Party revolt. So the new plan goes even further at a time when many communities are still struggling from a slow economy, even including a provision that prevents high unemployment areas from receiving additional assistance.

Today we have 47 million Americans living in poverty. And while we should

be doing more to address the root causes, we should not turn our backs on those struggling to make ends meet by cutting benefits that help put food on the table for working families.

I believe we all share the goal of seeing a stronger economy that creates jobs and reduces the need for this kind of assistance. But until that time, let's not make the most vulnerable among us pay the steepest price.

SNAP BENEFITS FOR VETERANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ENYART) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ENYART. Mr. Speaker, during the 35 years I spent in the military, it was my privilege to lead the outstanding men and women in our Armed Forces. Many are still serving today. They served with honor and distinction, yet here we are talking about treating the lowest paid of them like second-class citizens, unworthy of basic assistance in these difficult times.

I was elected to Congress to represent everyone in the 12th Congressional District of Illinois. I represent the poorest county in the State of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, 100,000 people in my district, most of them children or seniors, live below the poverty line. My district has a higher proportion of veterans than any other district in this State.

I answer to Active Duty military and veterans who rely on SNAP benefits to make ends meet. They exist in my district and in every district represented in this House. Mr. Speaker, does anyone in this Chamber wish to tell them that in this hour of need, their country is turning its back on them? Who among us wants to decide which of these veterans deserve assistance and which do not? I know I don't.

According to the Census Bureau, about 7 percent of people who report prior military service also report receiving SNAP benefits. Census data indicates that some 1.5 million households with a veteran are receiving SNAP benefits.

The base pay of most recent enlistees, from corporals on down, is at or below the \$23,050 poverty rate for a family of four. At military commissaries nationwide, nearly \$88 million in SNAP benefits were redeemed. Stars and Stripes reported that in 2011, food stamp purchases at military commissaries tripled during the preceding 4 years.

Just last month, the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities reported that approximately 900,000 veterans currently receive food aid and that proposed cuts would impact around 170,000.

According to The Hill newspaper, more than \$98 million in SNAP benefits were redeemed by veterans in 2012. The Huffington Post reports that in 2011, "both Active Duty members and retirees, together, used more than \$100 million in Federal food aid in the past year."

Sixteen percent of SNAP recipients are disabled, many of them are veterans. SNAP benefits are already scheduled to go down. On November 1, families of three will lose \$29 a month. Now, that doesn't sound like very much, but the daily per person per meal benefit will be less than \$1.40.

Recently, one Illinois veteran was quoted, saying, "I relocated, and the job I was supposed to get fell through. I lived off my savings but found myself needing to apply for emergency assistance to sustain until I found a job. I, like many others, was only receiving assistance for a time (5 months) but don't know what I would have done without it."

They served us with honor and distinction, Mr. Speaker. Some are still serving. Now it is time for us to serve them with a measure of honor and distinction of our own. I urge my colleagues to reject these shameful proposals which would cut this basic level of assistance to deserving recipients who need it now more than ever.

A SAD DAY IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLEAVER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I probably don't need 5 minutes to say what I would like to say.

This is a very sad moment for the most powerful Nation in the history of this planet. We are on the verge of a government shutdown over ideology. I can remember in 1995, I was the mayor of Kansas City when the government shut down and the impact was Herculean, not just here in Washington, but around the country and around the world. And if we are proud to be Americans, it means that we pay our bills.

We are the only nation that still allows a vote by a legislature on paying our bills. Most countries won't do that because they don't need any disruption in paying their debts. We are close to declaring to the whole world that we don't pay our bills.

The other part that's troublesome is this whole issue of SNAP, or food stamps. And there are so many myths that roll around that it just turns my stomach.

I lived in a house with no running water or electricity until I was 7 years old. We moved into public housing. My father worked three jobs. He eventually was able to buy a home.

I know what it's like to be poor. I know what it's like to struggle. My father was able to send my mother to college when I was in the eighth grade, and then all four of his children graduated from college, too, with postgraduate degrees. So I am always insulted when I hear all of these irreverent and nasty comments about poor people. And we spread this stuff around the country to the point of absurdity.

We spread lies. "Well, people go into stores and they buy alcohol with food stamps." Well, we don't have food

stamps anymore. We have cards, Economic Benefit Transfer cards. And in spite of the lies that people tell, you can't buy alcohol with cards. You can't buy lottery tickets. I heard Members of Congress—this Congress—tell people that they know that people in prison are getting food stamps, and they've seen people buy alcohol with food stamp cards. It doesn't work. And it divides and damages this Nation.

The other lie, over 70 percent of the people receiving SNAP benefits are the elderly, the disabled, and children. And we are against helping them? Another 25 percent are people who work every day, it's just that they can't make enough to survive.

I remember growing up and my mother would say, Eat everything on your plate; there are starving kids in Africa. Well, I'm not sure how eating everything on my plate helped them—I'm still struggling with that—but there are starving people not far from here, and the government of the United States is saying we'd rather shut down than to have a program that deals with the people who are in trouble.

I just heard a few moments ago about a 101-year-old person whose daily Meals on Wheels had been reduced. 101 years old, and people are celebrating that, Mr. Speaker? This is a sad, sad day. And by the end of next week, when we are shut down, it's going to be much sadder.

UNITED STATES FINANCIAL CRISIS: 5 YEARS LATER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the meltdown of Lehman Brothers, and the 5-year anniversary of the greatest financial crisis in a generation that struck our country. This economic disaster nearly caused the destruction of our country's entire financial infrastructure and led to what we now call the Great Recession.

However, Wall Street, during the last 5 years, has actually profited greatly from this crisis and, in the process, has caused continuing financial failures of millions of Americans. JPMorgan Chase, Bank of America, Citigroup, Wells Fargo, Goldman Sachs, and Morgan Stanley have all reported record profits during the recession.

□ 1045

Wall Street, in the last 5 years, has regained all of its pre-crisis wealth with interest. Wouldn't the American people like to be in that position?

Meanwhile, Main Street has yet to see a real robust recovery.

The roots of the recession began in the late 1990s, when a majority in this Congress first overturned something called the Glass-Steagall Act, which separated speculative banking from prudent banking and then, in 2000, refused to regulate the trading of derivatives.

By hamstringing the Commodity Futures Trading Commission and the Securities Exchange Commission, Wall Street turned once stable investments into the toxic assets that brought down our economy.

American taxpayers were then asked to bail out these same banks responsible for trashing our economy and facilitating the single greatest redistribution of wealth from the poor and middle class to the rich in American history. Our middle class has shrunk.

And guess what?

The ranks of the poor shot up. It's no wonder people can't afford to pay for food. American citizens continue to struggle to recuperate their lost wealth from a clever banking system that stole their equity.

The Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas recently reported that the cost of the collapse to the United States economy was up to \$14 trillion. Is it any wonder we have rising debt levels?

It could be more when you factor in potential permanent losses in earning power by Americans who aren't paying taxes anymore because they're not working yet.

According to the Economic Policy Institute, from 2000 to 2011, the median income for working-age households fell from approximately \$64,000 a year to \$55,000. This is a decline of nearly 13 percent.

The U.S. Census Bureau paints a similar bleak picture of the precipitous decline in American household income. It shows that the overall median income of households has continued to fall since the start of recession, and now, people are earning—guess what—similar to what their median income was in 1988. That's right. They've lost decades of income growth.

Income inequality has only widened during the crisis, where only the top 5 percent of income earners in our country saw an increase in their earnings between 2010 and 2011. The top is doing fine. Everybody else is not.

In addition, a GAO report earlier this year estimated the total loss in household equity from the crisis to be \$9 trillion. Those are some of your neighbors and mine. Indeed, what a property-taking that is.

Losses on this level prevent Americans from owning their own homes, opening their own businesses, or going to college and, ultimately, creating their own American Dream.

Meanwhile, on Wall Street, we see the enormous accumulation of banking assets and vast financial power in a handful of institutions. JPMorgan Chase, Bank of America, Goldman Sachs, all of them are making enormous profits, in fact, the highest profits in the nation, along with the oil companies.

Fifteen years ago, the assets of the six-largest banks were approximately 17 percent of gross domestic product. Today, estimates for the assets of those same banks are equivalent to over half of our gross domestic prod-

uct. So six institutions, JPMorgan Chase, Bank of America, Citigroup, Wells Fargo, Goldman Sachs and Morgan Stanley control an enormous percentage of our banking system and, in turn, your future and our nation's future. That is too much power in the hands of the big six.

America is currently in the midst of the slowest recovery from a recession since World War II, and it's important that this Congress not sit idly by. In the 5 years since the recession, our economy has only managed to put more money in the pockets of the top 1 percent, ignoring the difficulties of the bottom 99 percent.

One way to begin rectifying this situation is to reinstitute the Glass-Steagall Act. I ask my colleagues to cosponsor H.R. 129, the Return to Prudent Banking Act to restore the distinction between prudent banking and speculation. In addition, the executive branch should prosecute the predatory practices of those financial institutions that have led to this harm to the American people.

There should be no statute of limitation on the justice that is owed to the American people.

THE REPUBLICAN SNAP PROPOSAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong opposition to the deep cuts to nutrition programs that are being proposed this week by my friends on the other side of the aisle.

The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program provides critical food and nutrition support for hardworking families in cities and towns all across my home State in Rhode Island. The United States Department of Agriculture estimates that more than 180,000 Rhode Islanders rely on this important program every day.

Once again, House Republicans have decided, rather than working to come to a bipartisan agreement on the farm bill, that they will instead pander to the far right of their party and, in doing so, impose real hardships on America's working families and put many children at risk of going hungry all across our country.

While protecting generous subsidies for agricultural corporations, my Republican colleagues are threatening the food security of our most vulnerable neighbors. So let's review this package of cuts to the nutrition program and consider its impact on children, seniors, veterans and families.

First, the Congressional Budget Office estimates this proposal would cut SNAP funding by at least \$40 billion. Some of these cuts would be particularly devastating for seniors and low-income families.

For example, this bill would eliminate categorical eligibility, putting

working families at greater risk of going hungry and eliminating the incentive to find work.

Currently, a working mother who makes a little more than \$24,000 a year qualifies for SNAP if her disposable income falls under 130 percent of the poverty line due to the rising cost of child care or rent. This bill would eliminate this provision and deny some working mothers and children in 40 States from receiving necessary nutrition assistance.

Make no mistake: this places a cruel burden on working families who can least afford it.

But it gets worse. Another provision would require the mother of any child a year of age to work or participate in a training program or risk losing their nutrition assistance. At a time of high unemployment and dwindling resources for job training, this bill means that a 2-year-old could go hungry if the child's mother can't participate in job training or find work.

Of course these provisions don't only impact working families. Even a veteran receiving disability compensation could lose their exemption and have their nutrition assistance terminated if they can't find a job under this bill.

These cuts imposed on the backs of disabled veterans, children younger than 6, and working moms are bad enough. But to compound these cuts, the Republican farm bill makes it more likely additional beneficiaries will be hurt as well.

This legislation would actually encourage individual States to kick people off nutrition assistance by promising them 50 percent of the savings.

Of course, some of this is old news. We're here debating this issue again. Shockingly, the immoral, outrageous cuts I've already outlined weren't enough for the conservative fringe. They weren't satisfied with cutting funding for SNAP. They demanded even deeper cuts that would force more children and more unemployed workers to go hungry. They've insisted that more seniors and veterans, the people who helped build this country, should be turned away at their local market.

The House Republican leadership was happy to comply, and they decided to make a bad bill worse. They doubled the cuts imposed on the SNAP program and chose to slash nutrition assistance by a total of \$40 billion. These newer cuts target jobless adults without children who live in areas with high rates of unemployment.

The National Association of Evangelicals said they were "especially concerned" about this proposal.

Let's not mischaracterize this as a new work requirement. The changes proposed in this bill tell people who are struggling to find work in a difficult economy that if their job search goes on longer than 3 months, they should go hungry too. But the bill does not provide additional workforce training resources, and it doesn't invest in job creation to help individuals find work.

This sends a clear message. If you're struggling to find a job in an area hard-hit by the recession, get ready, because in a few months you're also going to struggle to eat.

Let's not forget the context in which this particular bill is drafted. It comes after House Republicans stripped out the nutrition title and passed the rest of the farm bill.

In other words, they were happy to provide agricultural companies with extremely generous subsidies to purchase crop insurance. They were happy to spend \$40 billion on commodity programs. But nutrition assistance for children and the underemployed was apparently a bridge too far.

Dozens of religious groups and other leaders have strongly opposed this bill. Earlier this week, the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops reminded us that "how the House chooses to address our Nation's hunger and nutrition programs will have a profound human and moral consequence."

The Jewish Federation argued that this bill "would constitute untenable trauma to millions of Americans and their families."

Former Senate Majority Leader Bob Dole, a Republican, warned "this is no time to play politics with hunger."

They've sent a clear message. This bill is wrong, it's immoral, and does not reflect our values as a country. I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this proposal.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 55 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend Dale Ribble, Oak Lake Church, Lincoln, Nebraska, offered the following prayer:

O Lord, You have been our dwelling place from the foundation of our country. We ask for wisdom from You, the all-wise God, for these leaders as they seek to lead our country.

Your word tells us that "wisdom from above is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, open to reason, full of mercy and good fruits, impartial, and sincere."

You have said that a harvest of righteousness is sown in peace by those who make peace. May these men and women be united in wisdom that leads to peace.

O Lord, may we, as a Nation who has known the greatness of Your mercy

and grace, not stray from seeking You and Your righteous ways, for You have said, "Blessed is the Nation whose God is the Lord." Keep us in the shelter of your wings and turn our hearts to You. In Jesus' name, amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WALBERG led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING REVEREND DALE RIBBLE

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RIBBLE) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. RIBBLE. Mr. Speaker, I am the youngest son of six sons, all children of an ordained Baptist minister. I have five older brothers, four who are still alive today. Three of them have responded to the call of ministry and are pastors. One of my own sons, Clint, is also a pastor. It's impossible to separate my faith heritage from my daily life. My brother, Dale Ribble, who is our guest chaplain today, is exactly the same.

From my earliest childhood memories, Dale was destined for ministry. As a child, I observed him countless times reaching out to people around him, both young and old, with a spirit of compassion and concern. He has a gift given to him by God for this purpose. The work that churches do in our communities change and affect lives for the positive. They reach out to the poor, the sick, and the hungry, improving the lives of whom they touch and enriching our communities. I've watched Dale do these things his entire life. I'm proud of his work and thank him for being with us today.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATHAM). The Chair will entertain 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

IF YOU CAN'T HELP EVERY CHILD, YOU CAN'T HELP ANY CHILD?

(Mr. WALBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, there was a time when the Southern Poverty Law Center was a laudable civil rights organization, boldly combating bigotry and extremism. Such noble pursuits have been cast aside for partisan politics, and today the SPLC is better known for their attacks on Judeo-Christian groups.

Recently, the SPLC has targeted the Alabama Accountability Act, a school choice law passed earlier this year. Under this act, Alabama provides tax credit scholarships for students at failing schools so that they can attend better-performing schools—private, religious, and nonfailing public schools.

Rather than allow students a chance at a good education, the SPLC has filed a lawsuit that would trap students in schools the State's own accountability system has graded D or F. In other words, if you can't help every child, you can't help any child? How absurd.

Mr. Speaker, it's time for this intolerance to end, and it's time that Congress and the American people embrace policies that allow parents and students the opportunity to choose the type of education that fosters success.

GUN VIOLENCE PREVENTION

(Mr. CICILLINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, 9 months after the tragedy at Sandy Hook Elementary School in Connecticut, our country is once again facing the terrible reality of another horrific mass shooting. In this case, 12 innocent men and women were murdered at the Washington Navy Yard just 2 days ago. I know that all of us are keeping the victims and their loved ones in our thoughts and prayers today.

All of us in this Chamber should ask ourselves whether there is anything that we could have done to prevent this tragedy. According to the Associated Press, the person who carried out this cowardly attack had previously complained about serious mental health issues, including paranoia, sleep disorder, and hearing voices in his head. And despite all of this, he legally purchased a shotgun from a firearms dealer in Virginia just last week.

Mr. Speaker, there is something seriously wrong in this country when someone with such serious mental illness is able to purchase a firearm without even the slightest bit of scrutiny.

We owe it to the victims of the Navy Yard and their families to finally close loopholes that allow criminals and the seriously mentally ill to purchase firearms. How many tragedies should we witness before we finally enact commonsense gun violence prevention?

OBAMACARE IS A THREAT TO SECURITY

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, this morning South Carolina Attorney General Alan Wilson testified before a joint committee on Capitol Hill warning that the health care takeover legislation is a threat to the security and safety of citizens.

The attorney general cited:

Despite the President saying last month, "We're well on our way to fully implementing the Affordable Care Act," important deadlines are being routinely missed. In order for the ACA to adequately determine the eligibility . . . it must create a data hub that connects databases from seven different agencies. However, the hub has not been beta tested, independently verified, or properly audited. When it goes live on October 1, it will be a con-man's all-you-can-eat buffet overflowing with a gold mine of sensitive information from the agency databases.

Attorney General Wilson summarized as follows:

Until HHS rectifies safeguarding Americans' personal information, Congress must suspend implementation of ACA.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

MONTH OF THE HISPANIC CHILD

(Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate not only Hispanic Heritage Month, but to celebrate the next generation of Hispanic leaders.

I applaud the national PTA for naming September the Month of the Hispanic Child.

With the Hispanic population totaling 53 million people in the U.S., Hispanic children and youth are the fastest growing population in America. By 2060, it is projected that Hispanics will be about 128 million people in the United States.

In order to produce the next generation of leaders that are capable and equipped to work and to tackle our future challenges, we must invest in every Hispanic child. Education and equal opportunity are what will ensure that these students fulfill the American promise.

I will continue to advocate for programs like Head Start and fight to make college more affordable for all children.

As we celebrate Hispanic Heritage Month, let us keep in mind that the younger generation will be our leaders of the future.

RENEWING THE CLINTON-GRINGRICH PARTNERSHIP

(Mr. McCLINTOCK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply saddened to see the President begin the sixth year of our Nation's economic malaise by renewing his partisan name-calling and finger-pointing on Monday.

Fortunately, we have a model for bipartisan economic cooperation. In 1995, when President Clinton realized that his policies weren't working, he reached across the aisle to work with the Republican House; and despite their political differences, they did some amazing things:

They reduced Federal spending by a miraculous 40 percent of GDP;

They produced the largest capital gains tax cut in American history;

They reformed entitlement spending by abolishing the open-ended welfare system we had at the time;

They delivered 4 years of budget surpluses.

These bipartisan policies produced a period of prolonged economic expansion and unprecedented prosperity for America's middle and working classes.

Republicans have been eager to repeat these successful bipartisan policies of the Clinton years. Why isn't the President?

THE REPUBLICAN NUTRITION REFORM AND WORK OPPORTUNITY ACT

(Mrs. BEATTY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition of H.R. 3102, the Republican Nutrition Reform and Work Opportunity Act.

America should be uncomfortable because this bill would cut \$40 billion in critical nutrition assistance programs, denying SNAP benefits to at least 4 million low-income Americans, affecting children, seniors, the disabled, and veterans.

America should be uncomfortable because this Republican deal affects unemployed adults with an average income of just \$2,500 per year who would immediately lose their SNAP benefits.

America should be uncomfortable because this bill hurts Americans living in rural, urban, and suburban areas. For many, SNAP benefits are the only thing that keeps them from living with hunger and malnutrition and sickness.

America should be uncomfortable. We should not cut these funds. These are extreme cuts of one of the most effective programs we have combating hunger.

SNAP

(Ms. BASS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition of H.R. 3102, the Nutrition Reform and Work Opportunity Act.

Contrary to the rhetoric of my Republican colleagues, the overwhelming

majority of SNAP recipients who can work do so. Among SNAP households with an able-bodied adult, more than 50 percent work while receiving SNAP benefits. They just do not earn enough money to provide food for their families. In my district in Los Angeles, nearly 77 percent of families receiving SNAP benefits are working families.

The Republican attack on SNAP is a sad example of not understanding the struggles faced by so many Americans, including many of their own constituents. SNAP benefits help low-wage working families make ends meet as they try to get back on their feet. Millions of families rely on SNAP as they struggle with unemployment and low wages in the wake of the recession. The House Republican proposal would recklessly cut assistance for at least 4 million to 6 million people who need help, and we cannot let this happen.

NATIONAL PREPAREDNESS MONTH

(Mr. HIGGINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, September is National Preparedness Month, and preparedness includes making sure that the public has access to timely information in cases of emergency. For many Americans, public broadcasting is a vital source of important emergency announcements.

Over 98 percent of the American population has access to public radio or a television signal. In times of emergency, public broadcasting is a go-to source of information for emergency management officials and first responders. We have a responsibility to ensure that stations that are damaged in a disaster are repaired and operational as quickly as possible.

That's why I've introduced the Emergency Information Improvement Act. My bill clarifies that local public radio and television stations are eligible for assistance to rebuild their facilities when they are damaged in a federally designated disaster such as a storm or terrorist attack.

This legislation will help ensure that this important informational resource will be available to Americans in times of need.

I invite my colleagues to support this legislation.

SNAP

(Mr. GARCIA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for the SNAP program, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program.

SNAP is a critically important program. It helps struggling families put food on the table while they work to get back on their feet. It helps our Nation's most vulnerable, as nearly two-thirds of recipients are children, elderly, and disabled. And according to new

census data just released yesterday, the SNAP program helped lift 4 million people out of poverty in 2012. Additionally, this is a multiplier of 2½ times in our economy.

Unfortunately, it is my understanding that the House of Representatives may soon consider legislation that cuts \$40 billion in funding from SNAP. This is the wrong approach. At a time when many families and communities are still struggling to get back on their feet from the Great Recession, we should be working to strengthen, not undermine, the SNAP program.

□ 1215

CUTTING \$40 BILLION FROM THE NUTRITION PROGRAM

(Ms. KUSTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart because this body will soon consider a bill that will cut 4 million children from their nutrition benefits. Americans will go hungry. In my district and across this country, these are our friends, our neighbors, our fellow parishioners. They are children and veterans and seniors.

One of my constituents wrote to me recently about how Federal nutrition assistance is essential to feeding her family. She is 28 years old, disabled, and an orphan, so she has no family to fall back upon. And she is the mother of a toddler. On top of all that, she's in college, working to get her undergraduate degree, and has a double major, no less. But right now, she depends on the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program to feed her toddler, and that assistance doesn't even go far enough. She still has to rely on our local food bank and other community assistance.

This is who we are talking about when we debate cutting \$40 billion from the nutrition program. We can and should do better.

SNAP AND THE FARM BILL

(Mrs. NEGRETE McLEOD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. NEGRETE McLEOD. Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention to the seriousness of the proposed \$40 billion cut to the nutrition bill. As a member of the House Agriculture Committee, I am gravely concerned with this bill, as it circumvented proper deliberation before the Agriculture Committee. This bill lacks the transparency required by the American people and is outside the custom and practice of all past farm bills this House has passed.

I am ready to vote for a farm bill, but we are no closer to finding a compromise than we were 6 months ago. This issue is about Americans' ability to eat, as our country struggles to

come out of the greatest financial crisis since the Great Depression.

SNAP is a vital tool in empowering Americans in a challenging economy and should not be the sole factor in solving the Nation's long-term fiscal problems. Costs for the program will shrink as the economy improves and people are able to do exactly what Americans want to do: put food on the table.

RAISE THE MINIMUM WAGE

(Ms. WILSON of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we wonder why people need nutrition assistance in the first place. Well, it's because our minimum wage is inadequate, and it's because the government has given up on creating jobs. A parent working full-time at minimum wage will simply not earn enough income to cover basic needs.

SNAP recipients are not lazy. It's this Congress that is lazy.

Mr. Speaker, if you want to cut \$40 billion in nutrition funding, I have a two-part plan for you. Raise the minimum wage so workers can feed themselves, and pass the American Jobs Act so Americans can find work in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, the working poor, seniors, and children are suffering now, and you plan to cut nutrition assistance? Not only will they suffer, but some may die.

It's time for this Congress to address the real issues: raise the minimum wage, and jobs, jobs, jobs.

OPPOSITION TO THE REPUBLICAN NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PLAN

(Mr. PAYNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I'm not one to go on and on about a lot of statistics, but as we debate the nutrition bill, there is one that struck a chord with me. One in four, yes, one in four children go to bed hungry every night. And I'm not talking about in Africa, China, or India. I'm talking about one in four children who live right here in the United States going to sleep without adequate nutrition.

For me and the 1 million New Jerseyans on SNAP, this is a complete and total outrage. We live in the greatest country on Earth, yet 17 million children in this country do not get the nutrition they need.

Last year alone, SNAP lifted 4 million people out of poverty. The bill on the floor this week, which would cut SNAP by nearly \$40 billion, will only ensure that these people are pushed right back into poverty.

That's why I strongly oppose the nutrition assistance bill; and I urge my colleagues to examine their conscience and remember that, when they cast

their vote, they are casting their vote for or against one in four children who still go to bed at night hungry.

THE ATTACK ON POOR, DISADVANTAGED, AND HUNGRY PEOPLE ACT

(Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express strong opposition to H.R. 3102, what I call the Attack on Poor, Disadvantaged, and Hungry People Act. This bill will cut food stamps by \$40 billion; and, as a result of that, at least 4 million low-income individuals will no longer be eligible to receive nutrition assistance.

I say shame on whoever concocted this draconian idea, whoever put this proposal together, and certainly shame on us if we vote for it.

WEIGH OUR OPTIONS BEFORE CUTTING SNAP

(Ms. SEWELL of Alabama asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong opposition to H.R. 3102, calling for a \$40 billion cut in critically needed funding for nutrition assistance programs.

You know, Mr. Speaker, struggling to encourage my Republican colleagues to take a walk in the shoes of those who suffer from food insecurity has become uncomfortably common in this Chamber. In this House, we have moved beyond poor economic doctrine and immoral social policy, and we're now dealing with the very dangerous mindset that the weakest in our society are to blame for their condition.

Instead of taking away food stamps, we should be encouraging jobs. That we should be encouraging smaller assistance for those who are in need is not, I think, the way that this policy should go. We should be incentivizing companies to provide a living wage. And I think it's hypocritical for us to value the sanctity of life while neglecting policies that ensure all Americans have a better quality of life.

Mr. Speaker, 54 percent of the households in my district receive SNAP. I think that it's really important that we remember the people that we're sent here to represent.

PANCREATIC CANCER RESEARCH

(Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I have recently met with some constituents from New Mexico whose lives have been impacted by pancreatic cancer,

the deadliest of all major forms of cancer. It's not easy to hear a woman talk about losing her husband, a sister talk about losing her brother, or even a father talk about losing his daughter.

It's not easy to listen to their stories, but it's important, and here's why: pancreatic cancer is the fourth leading cause of cancer deaths in this country; the 5-year survival rate is just 6 percent; and there are still no early detection tools or lifesaving treatments.

Last year, Democrats and Republicans came together to pass the Recalcitrant Cancer Research Act, which requires the National Cancer Institute to develop a scientific framework for combating both pancreatic cancer and lung cancer. Unfortunately, the much-needed progress we stand to make is in serious jeopardy. Largely because of sequestration, the National Cancer Institute's budget has been drastically cut.

This is simply unacceptable, and it's yet another reason why I continue to call for a permanent fix to sequestration. The country deserves it; those constituents I met with deserve it; and everyone who has lost a loved one to pancreatic cancer deserves it.

The SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

(Ms. HANABUSA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, sometimes we use words like "SNAP," and people don't know what it means. SNAP means Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program. It's supplemental to what people receive. Nutrition, that's its main purpose, and it just gives assistance.

What we are proposing to vote on is a bill that would cut \$40 billion from SNAP. What it means—and this is something that's very important for us to recognize—is it means children will lose access to things like free school lunches. For some children, that's the best meal of the day that they have. We know hundreds of thousands will lose that.

Mr. Speaker, 1.7 million people, 850,000 households will be reduced by \$90 a month. Think about your own budgets and think about what \$90 will mean for a family that needs assistance. And in addition, this bill will ask disabled people to work 20 hours a week before they can even qualify for supplemental nutrition assistance.

Mr. Speaker, this is a mean-spirited measure, and Congress should not be defined by that.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 761, NATIONAL STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MINERALS PRODUCTION ACT OF 2013

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 347 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 347

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 761) to require the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to more efficiently develop domestic sources of the minerals and mineral materials of strategic and critical importance to United States economic and national security and manufacturing competitiveness. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Utah is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask that all Members have 5 legislative days in which they may revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides for a structured rule for consideration of H.R. 761,

the National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act. It provides one hour of general debate, equally divided between both sides. It provides for five amendments, four of which are Democrat amendments and one is a Republican amendment. So this rule is fair to a fault and it is totally generous, and it will provide a balanced and open debate as long as we, as Members, structure our remarks to the merits of this particular bill and don't go off on tangents.

□ 1230

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to stand before the House and support this rule. It's a good rule.

I also support the underlying bill, H.R. 761, and I want to congratulate the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. AMODEI), as sponsor of this particular piece of legislation, as well as the chairman of the Natural Resources Committee, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS), for his leadership in this particular effort.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation is blessed with an abundance of resources, which has made us a leading world economy and industrial power, and we have only scratched the surface, literally, of what we can potentially develop.

We have energy potential such as coal, oil shale, and natural gas deposits, as well as various critical minerals that we, as a Nation, need and should be developing.

But unfortunately, much of this development of our domestic mineral resources has actually been stymied by a combination of special interest politics, as well as bureaucratic red tape, particularly under this administration. It is a pain we have all seen coming.

Twenty-five years ago, 20 percent of all money that was spent for development and production of critical minerals was spent here in the United States. Today that's down to only 8 percent, as other nations have replaced our efforts, unfortunately.

This has meant an increase in our trade imbalance, dollars going overseas, escalating prices here at home for both energy and commodities. It means job losses here in the United States. And ironically, these jobs that we are losing are some of the highest-paying middle class jobs that are available. Bureaucratic delays are causing this, and they are causing us to see a change, both for manufacturing and defense.

Twenty-five years ago, there were 30 minerals that we actually had to import to this Nation that were considered critical minerals. Today that number has gone from 30 to 61.

Twenty-five years ago, there were 16 minerals that we imported a great majority of. Today that number that has gone to 24.

It affects manufacturing, such as electronics and metal alloys, ceramics, glass, magnets, catalysts, everything. It affects our defense as well, as our Defense Logistics Agency tries to

stockpile these minerals so the demands are there when we actually need them.

Unfortunately, as we've illustrated, more and more of these are being purchased from overseas. They are critical to our weapons development system, including such things as night vision equipment, advanced lasers, avionics, fighter jet components, missile guidance systems, and it goes on and on.

Look, the Constitution tells us that our first responsibility is to provide for a common defense. This bill steps us into the right direction so we actually can provide for a common defense and do it intelligently and avoid unnecessary and frivolous delays.

There are some that will criticize us for the kinds of minerals that we are placing in this restriction area. There was a study in 2009 that was done called the Great California ShakeOut, which was a mock of what could happen if the big earthquake actually hit that area, and it found out that, in an effort to try and rebuild the infrastructure that would be necessary, there's a whole list of things we normally don't consider as critical that would, in that situation, be critical, including sand and gravel, that we simply would have a frightful deficiency of if we were trying to rebuild under those types of critical situations.

This bill anticipates that, and makes sure that we will not be found lacking, either in defense, or in manufacturing, or in critical civilian needs in case of disaster.

This bill doesn't predetermine anything. It simply says, make a decision, yes or no, on whether this project should go forward; simply make a decision, and do it in a timely fashion.

We still, today, average between 7 and 10 years in which those decisions are made. This bill says that that is unrealistic, and it simply says, you've got 30 months—2½ years—to make a decision, yes or no. If you have to have an extension, it provides for that on common agreement, which is only rational to do. But for heaven's sakes, finally make a decision.

It is based on not only what we are talking about here, but it's based on what we are doing in our transportation area. It's based on a Presidential concept; when the President established an Executive Order No. 13604, which talked about the importance of trying to streamline reform and reference our process.

This is the basis of what we are attempting to do in this particular bill as well. This implies that whenever there are agencies, multiple agencies involved in a project, that there must be a lead agency which must take the responsibility of actually getting the job done, so that any kind of environmental statement should be being done currently, not sequentially, that we can make sure that any kind of lawsuit does not stop the process of making a decision.

Once again, this is one of those things that simply is logical. Just

make a decision. You have plenty of time to do it. Make a decision. There is no reason we cannot make a decision on whether to go forward on a project in 2½ years, none, none whatsoever.

The fact that we are dragging our feet is simply done from bureaucratic excess that is illogical and irrational. We have done this in other areas. This is the time to do this in this area as well.

If, indeed, we could do this process, it would be very clear that this Nation would prosper. We could have good-paying jobs, and we could make the desert blossom.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Utah, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes and, Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I deem necessary.

Mr. Speaker, the House faces a number of pressing issues that everybody in America knows that we should be addressing. Instead, we are here today on H. Res. 347, a structured rule, and the underlying bill, H.R. 761, the National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act of 2013.

I get it that my friends from areas that have these minerals in public spaces would like for us to proceed apace to extract them. I understand their feelings. I come from yet another of the critical areas of our country that we have to protect much of the space of, and that would be the Everglades.

I don't understand why Congress is trying to provide even more breaks to the United States mining operations when we do have these urgent domestic issues that we are confronted with and, somehow or another, that we were unable to undertake.

We haven't done all of our appropriations. We are having difficulty getting a continuing resolution. We will soon be faced with lifting the debt ceiling. And somehow or another, we are dealing with something that, I might add, we have voted on before, that came out of the House of Representatives, that did not pass the Senate, and H.R. 761 is not going to pass the Senate either.

So H.R. 761 guts important environmental protections offered through the National Environmental Policy Act, referred to as NEPA. It fails to require adequate financial assurance, and I will have an amendment on the floor that will address that subject, and offers other benefits to mining companies.

Mining operations in the United States benefit already from multiple Federal tax breaks, exemptions to regulation under existing environmental laws, and no royalty payments to the United States for mining operations, even on U.S. land.

Mining companies limit their liability for environmental restoration and cleanup by operating with U.S. subsidiaries to foreign parent companies. This relationship shields the parent com-

pany from liability and has allowed parent companies to draw profits from United States mining operations.

So what happens when companies do not pay for environmental damage caused by their operations?

The people of the United States pay. They pay through a contaminated environment. They pay through sickness, including cancer. They pay through taxes, because taxpayer dollars are ultimately needed to clean up these sites.

It would seem that we should have learned from our mistakes with the 1872 General Mining Law. Mining companies should be held accountable so that their operations will not impose additional burdens on the American people.

H.R. 761 not only takes away valued natural resources for hiking, fishing, canoeing and other recreational activities, it shifts the burdens of mining cleanup and restoration to the American taxpayer.

Furthermore, H.R. 761 classifies domestic mining operations for strategic and critical minerals on Federal lands as infrastructure projects. Using a broad definition that encompasses virtually every type of mine, this legislation allows mines to take advantage of a Presidential order from 2012 which requires Federal agencies to streamline the permitting process for infrastructure projects.

However, building a mine is not the same as building roads and highways that are much needed in this country, or replacing rotted sewerage that is much needed in this country, which is, in fact, the country's infrastructure.

Bills like this are why, in my opinion, the American people are so frustrated with us here in the United States Congress. We have a number of issues that we could—no, not that we could, that we should be working on—and, yet, we are rehashing a bill that went nowhere last Congress, ain't gonna go nowhere this Congress and, most importantly, is bad for the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I just want to make a couple of comments before we go on with the discussion of this particular rule, which, once again, is a fair rule and is a good rule.

This bill is one of those bills that has no significant cost to the budget. At no time does this stop any of the NEPA requirements. All it says is, do your job and do it on time. Nothing big about that, simply what those regulations are.

And it is obviously one of those things that takes place that we desperately need, both for the manufacturing sector, as well as for defense.

Look, I'm old. I still use legal pads. I trust those. They never crash on me. But if you have an iPhone or an iPad or any of that other kind of new stuff that my kids like to have, you're going to

have these critical minerals. And if we are not proposing and developing them here in the United States, we are paying more to develop them out of country, and we're putting ourselves, manufacturing-wise, in a significant deficit situation. And obviously, with the defense, what is happening is even more critical.

This is simply taking the executive order and saying, yeah, it's good for infrastructure; it's also good for our critical mineral development system, and saying, do the job. Do it well, do it quickly, get it done in a reasonable period of time, and don't drag this stuff out by sequencing the issues and the actions one after the other. You have a period of time. Do your job.

It's an amazing concept of asking the bureaucracy of this Nation to actually do their job, but it's important.

Yes, it was passed in the last session by an overwhelming bipartisan vote. It's a bipartisan bill. The fact that the Senate did not take it up is another indictment to Senate leadership, admittedly, an oxymoron, but it's another indictment for the Senate leadership for ignoring the significant issues that we have to face in this Nation. It's another indictment that they should actually do their job.

Just because the Senate leadership decides to sit on these type of issues does not mean we have to sit on them as well. This is something we have to have, and it needs to go over to the Senate. If it has to go over every week to the Senate until the Senate finally decides to actually do something, then that is our responsibility, and we should do it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from improper characterizations of leadership of the other body.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased to yield 3 minutes to my good friend from Oregon, (Mr. DEFAZIO), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Natural Resources.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the gentleman.

Great name. We're really good at messaging around here, particularly on the Republican side. It's got a great name: National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act of 2013.

Now we've heard just earlier that this is about things that are in critical short supply, vital for our national security and for emergencies.

□ 1245

None of those things are true. They could be a miniscule part of this.

But what this bill does is say that any mining project anywhere on any public lands in the United States of America does not constitute a significant Federal action. No matter how large, no matter how sensitive the area, no matter how proximate to the Grand Canyon and national treasures or how proximate to Yellowstone or

how proximate to some critical watershed, that's not a major Federal action. So it's exempt from NEPA. That's one very big problem with this legislation. I think there's a lot of members of the public even living in very conservative areas of the country who would find that a little bit of overreach.

And then, again, these critical minerals are not critical. Sand and gravel are now critical. Anything is critical that you can find on public land. Any dirt of any sort, you are going to get an expedited process. That's a little bit of overreach.

We're going to have a great amendment by Mr. LOWENTHAL, who will use an actual definition from the National Research Council for strategic and critical minerals. So if this is on the up-and-up, the other side will accept that amendment and we will have these expedited processes, which still cause us some anxiety; but they will only be for truly strategic and critical materials, not everything and anything on any public land.

Secondly, most Americans would be appalled—those who don't already know—to learn that we give away all of the minerals on our public lands: gold, uranium, platinum. No matter what it is, we give it away. We do not charge. Unlike many western States, unlike Native American tribal lands, unlike private lands, unlike most foreign countries, we don't charge a royalty for extracting minerals from our lands, no matter how valuable, no matter how many billions of dollars that that load might be worth of platinum or gold or uranium. No charge. Give it away.

Twice this body has passed, on a bipartisan basis, historically, a modest royalty on the extraction of depletable valuable minerals from Federal lands. I've been very involved in that in the past. In the summer, I went to the Rules Committee when this bill was first going to come up.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. DEFAZIO. They admit there are no parliamentary issues, no scoring issues. In fact, with my amendment, an 8 percent royalty would raise hundreds of millions of dollars. And those hundreds of millions of dollars would be used to remediate hundreds of thousands of mines in the West that are polluting the environment, polluting our rivers.

I have a foreign company in my district that, yeah, they put up their million-dollar bond. Unfortunately, they left the country, and it's a \$14 million cleanup. The public is going to get stuck with that. It's polluting the river, killing fish, and the taxpayers are going to have to pay for it.

My amendment would have raised the resources necessary to deal with hundreds of thousands of abandoned mines in the western United States

that need remediation and mitigation, but the Republicans were afraid to vote on that amendment.

Some in the West know it's a problem. They didn't want to vote against fixing the problem. Others just say you should run the government like a business, except when it comes to valuable minerals. We want to give them away. We don't really care about the deficit.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. If we defeat the previous question, I'm going to offer an amendment to this rule that will allow the House to hold a vote on the Bring Jobs Home Act. This bill will help to boost the economy by encouraging businesses to bring more jobs to America and discourage companies from shipping jobs overseas.

To discuss our proposal, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), my good friend.

Mr. PASCRELL. Thank you, Mr. HASTINGS.

I rise, Mr. Speaker, in strong opposition to the rule and the underlying bill before us today, H.R. 761, the National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act of 2013. I just think it goes too far.

I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question and take up this legislation, which we've worked on for a full year now, the Bring Jobs Home Act, a bill which, for the first time, makes sure we promote insourcing of jobs and stop the corporate welfare business for outsourcing jobs.

The underlying legislation would set a dangerous precedent by waiving mining projects from environmental reviews and eliminating public access to the justice system itself. Pushing mining projects through the permitting process is sure to continue to degrade our environment and create workplace situations which are definitely unsafe. But it won't solve the employment problem.

Since that's been injected into the discussion, the legislation will simply allow our Nation's resources to be used to pad the pockets of the same international corporations who ship jobs overseas; and, by the way, that process of shipping jobs overseas is subsidized by the Federal Government. We have for years helped corporations send jobs overseas. What we should be doing is helping them get jobs back to America, particularly since we see an upgrading of the past 16 months in the manufacturing sector of our economy.

With this bill we're going to end the tax breaks that encourage companies to ship their jobs overseas and use that to pay for tax credits for patriotic companies that want to bring jobs back home. Do you want to have real job improvement? This is the way to do it.

Over the last decade we've lost 5.5 million manufacturing jobs—more than during the entire Great Depression. Our trade deficit increased by \$300 billion. During the recession, the manufacturing workforce plummeted to a near 60-year low.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. PASCRELL. More troubling, Mr. Speaker, is that recent studies estimate that one-quarter of American jobs are at risk of being outsourced in the coming years. We're not talking about chump change here. This is a lot of jobs.

So let's defeat this motion so we can actually debate a bill that will end corporate welfare that allows companies to continue to engage in outsourcing and then get a tax cut for doing so. Instead, let's provide incentives that will grow good-paying manufacturing jobs in the USA.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would ask my friend if he's prepared to close. I have no further speakers at this time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Obviously, I am prepared to close. It depends on how long your closing goes.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I can make it go as long as you want it to go.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Picking up where Mr. PASCRELL left off, which I wasn't intending to do until my good friend from Utah mentioned the timeframe. Tomorrow, we are going to vote on whether or not to cut \$40 billion from the supplemental nutrition program for people this country. One of the measures included in that is going to be that people can only qualify for 3 months during a specified period of time if they are able-bodied people.

Well, if you vote for the previous question that Mr. PASCRELL offered, there may be some jobs for those people. Otherwise, what we're getting ready to do is put more people in a position of needing the food stamps. And we continue to talk about jobs, but we haven't done anything on the infrastructure.

I predict even if this measure before us today were to become law, which it is not, but if it did by chance become law, we would be lucky if in the course of time we had the kind of jobs and the number of jobs that are desperately needed in this country.

What is wrong with this institution? Don't we understand that we have college kids that are graduating and they can't find a job? We hire kids up here at lower than the minimum wage because they can't find jobs in the private sector. This is crazy.

We can't continue doing nothing when in fact the people are suffering in this great country of ours. We have not only the natural resources that my friends would have us extract from even public lands without paying royalties, but we have the resources as a people to do the things creatively to assist us in bringing jobs here rather than sending them all over the world and causing a diminution of jobs here at home.

Again, for the life of me I don't understand why we are considering this bill today. We're considering virtually every mine on public land, including uranium and coal mines, to operate without adherence to Federal environmental laws, which protect public safety. Our priorities are truly in the wrong place.

As I asked before, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule and the underlying legislation, and I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question. I urge a "no" vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I appreciate the opportunity we have of presenting this particular rule to the body. I've always appreciated the opportunity of sharing this time with the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), who is a good friend and a very colorful orator. And I always like to hear his orations here on the floor.

You'll forgive me if I want to try and refocus on the matter that it is hand, for, indeed, I recognize the statements that have been made by the last two speakers that deal with the significance of jobs. What we simply have to have is a policy in this country that promotes private sector jobs, not just government sector jobs.

By promoting private sector jobs, we actually expand the economy and build upon that concept. That is one of the reasons why this particular bill is here. But all of a sudden you go from 30 minerals that we had to import from other areas to 61 minerals that we now have to import from abroad. That means there are a bunch of minerals that we used to be producing in good, high-paying jobs that no longer are there.

So this is one of the areas that we can move our country in the proper direction and not just simply say, Okay, let's create some kind of make-work program that actually adds particular jobs. It needs to be the right kind of jobs to move our country forward.

One person once told me the people sitting here is the entire universe with which we talk. We will not make ourselves rich by paying each other to take vacations. At some time, someone has to add real wealth into the equation. That's what this bill is trying to do. We have critical mineral wealth in this country. It needs to be added to the equation so that we can create those good-paying mining jobs that will spin off into good-paying manufacturing jobs in the private sector. That's everything we are attempting to do.

I would like to take one issue and try to put it to rest as to the idea that these companies who would be receiving benefit from this are somehow getting off and not paying taxes or royalties. They are not paying Federal taxes, but sometimes we forget that we're not the only equation out there. Every one of these pays significant royalties and severance taxes to State and local governments.

□ 1300

The Federal tax that is proposed by some of the amendments to this bill would be on top of that. It would be a form of double taxation. Its goal would be to raise money, which is a nice goal, but simply because you found a potential effort for the Federal Government to try and raise more money doesn't mean you need to rush into that, especially when it has a negative aspect somewhere else. It would have a negative aspect on State and local governments. It would also have a negative aspect on those companies that some people don't want to have any empathy for the situation they're in.

If you actually put an additional Federal royalty on top of the State and local royalty which they are paying and the severance tax that you are paying, in a traditional company you could pass that tax burden on to the consumer. In a world market, you cannot. That just doesn't happen. It has to come out from the company itself.

The companies who are involved in here have clearly said that they are not opposed if we could put some kind of net proceeds up. But these kinds of proposals that we will be hearing in the debate today are not net proceeds tax; they are an unparalleled, unprecedented gross tax. Nothing has ever gone to that level in which the amendments would try to put on this program.

So once again, what we're trying to ask you to do is look at this in the overall view of what we are trying to do to develop real and good private sector jobs.

The underlying element still goes back to the fact that, look, what we need is to go through the permitting process but to do it in a way that is legitimate. It should not have to wait 7 to 10 years to actually permit something. That is just unrealistic.

I apologize, Mr. Speaker. I am an old schoolteacher. As a schoolteacher, we had 9 months to do something. If you couldn't get it done in 9 months, you didn't get it done. There was no idea of just postponing it to a future date. If a principal came to me and said we're going to have to have our testing done on Tuesday for the standardized test, I couldn't say no, I can't do that; let's wait for 2 weeks and maybe—maybe—I will be ready to help you with the testing data. In any education system, when the time is up, the time is up. You have to do the work, and you back-schedule to make sure that you actually do the work. That happens in

almost every element of society except for here in government.

When I was in the State legislature, we had a constitutional end of that State legislative date. We had 45 days to make a decision. Often those decisions are not easy and you make the better of the bad choices that you have, but we had to make a decision.

I contrast that with what is happening here in the United States Government in which the Forest Service was asked to do a study on a potential bridge that we could transfer from Federal ownership over to State ownership. They said yes, in about 4 years we would be able to do that study. Four years to do a simple study? We give ourselves these unreasonable and inexcusable time references, and we do it all the time.

I had a bill that we passed a couple of years ago and which mandated that a certain agency of government had to give a piece of property over to the local entity of government. Congress passed it. They mandated it. Now here, 2½ years later, the agency still has not transferred that land. They are going through their surveys. They are taking their time. Even the local government had to pay for all these time-consuming surveys. What Congress mandated, 2 years later, still has not happened. That is unrealistic. In the private sector, no one would tolerate that. In our State government, no one would actually tolerate that. In the education community, no one would tolerate that. Yet we look at that as the norm, 7 to 10 years, as an average, to actually permit these things?

That is why what this bill is trying to do is say, look, go through the process, use the NEPA process, but do it in a fair and rational way and make a decision. You don't drag things out just for the fun of dragging things out. If the decision is yes, fine; if the decision is no, fine; but for heaven's sake, make a decision.

Some elements of government, whom I will not make caricatures about even if it's true, some elements seem to like to drag out decisions. This is an area that should not be. So this simply says, if you're going to deal with this area, you've got 30 months to make a decision. You can do that in 2½ years. There is no reason why it cannot be.

We are doing this in other areas of the government. The President, in his executive order, said this has to be the way we move forward. This bill moves us forward.

This bill does a good thing. It was right that it passed in the last session by a huge bipartisan vote because it's the right thing to do. It's the right message. It's the right program. It moves us forward. It's the right thing to do this year. And we will continue to push this until at some point we have succeeded in making sure that we are moving forward with hard deadlines so that decisions are made and we're not just piddling and piddling and waiting and delaying time after time.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very good bill. It was a good bill last time we passed it. It's still a good bill. We need to pass this bill again. It's also a very good rule. It's a fair rule. It's a rule for which we can be proud.

I would urge my colleagues to make sure that we vote for this rule so we can move forward on a bill that should have been passed by both bodies a long time ago. But we need to, once again, start this process and continue going forward because it is the right thing to do. It will provide us with resources; it will provide us with jobs; it will provide us, more importantly, with decisions. Finally, we can actually have an agency that makes a decision in a timely manner.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 347 OFFERED BY
MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

Sec. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 851) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage domestic insourcing and discourage foreign outsourcing. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

Sec. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 851 as specified in section 2 of this resolution.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT
REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's *Precedents of the House of Representatives* (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that

"the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution. . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's *Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives*, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of House Resolution 347, if ordered, and the motion to suspend the rules on H.R. 301.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 229, nays 192, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 463]

YEAS—229

Aderholt Graves (GA) Pittenger
 Alexander Graves (MO) Pitts
 Amash Griffin (AR) Poe (TX)
 Amodei Griffith (VA) Pompeo
 Bachmann Grimm Posey
 Bachus Guthrie Price (GA)
 Barletta Hall Radel
 Barr Hanna Reed
 Barton Harper Reichert
 Benishek Harris Renacci
 Bentivolio Hartzler Ribble
 Bilirakis Hastings (WA) Rice (SC)
 Bishop (UT) Heck (NV) Rigell
 Black Hensarling Roby
 Blackburn Holding Roe (TN)
 Boustany Hudson Rogers (AL)
 Brady (TX) Huelskamp Rogers (KY)
 Bridenstine Huizenga (MI) Rogers (MI)
 Brooks (AL) Hultgren Rohrabacher
 Brooks (IN) Hunter Rokita
 Broun (GA) Hurt Rooney
 Buchanan Issa Ros-Lehtinen
 Buschon Jenkins Roskam
 Burgess Johnson (OH) Ross
 Calvert Johnson, Sam Rothfus
 Camp Jones Royce
 Campbell Jordan Runyan
 Cantor Joyce Ryan (WI)
 Capito Kelly (PA) Salmon
 Carter King (IA) Sanford
 Cassidy King (NY) Scalise
 Chabot Kingston Schock
 Chaffetz Kinzinger (IL) Schweikert
 Coble Kline Scott, Austin
 Coffman Labrador Sensenbrenner
 Cole LaMalfa Sessions
 Collins (GA) Lamborn Shimkus
 Collins (NY) Lance Shuster
 Conaway Lankford Simpson
 Cook Latham Smith (MO)
 Cotton Latta Smith (NE)
 Cramer LoBiondo Smith (NJ)
 Crawford Long Smith (TX)
 Crenshaw Lucas Southerland
 Culberson Luetkemeyer Stewart
 Daines Lummis Stivers
 Davis, Rodney Marchant Stockman
 Denham Marino Stutzman
 Dent Massie Terry
 DeSantis McCarthy (CA) Thompson (PA)
 DesJarlais McCaul Thornberry
 Duffy McClintock Tiberi
 Duncan (SC) McHenry Tipton
 Duncan (TN) McKeon Turner
 Ellmers McKinley Upton
 Farenthold McMorris Valadao
 Fincher Rodgers Wagner
 Fitzpatrick Meadows Walberg
 Fleischmann Meehan Walden
 Fleming Messer Walorski
 Flores Mica Weber (TX)
 Forbes Miller (FL) Webster (FL)
 Fortenberry Miller (MI) Wenstrup
 Foxx Mullin Westmoreland
 Franks (AZ) Mulvaney Whitfield
 Frelinghuysen Murphy (PA) Williams
 Gardner Neugebauer Wilson (SC)
 Garrett Noem Wittman
 Gerlach Nugent Wolf
 Gibbs Nunes Womack
 Gibson Nunnelee Woodall
 Gingrey (GA) Olson Yoder
 Gohmert Palazzo Yoho
 Goodlatte Paulsen Young (AK)
 Gosar Pearce Young (FL)
 Gowdy Perry Young (IN)
 Granger Petri

NAYS—192

Andrews Capps Cooper
 Barber Capuano Costa
 Barrow (GA) Cárdenas Crowley
 Bass Carney Cuellar
 Beatty Carson (IN) Cummings
 Becerra Cartwright Davis (CA)
 Bera (CA) Castor (FL) Davis, Danny
 Bishop (GA) Castro (TX) DeFazio
 Bishop (NY) Chu DeGette
 Blumenauer Delaney
 Bonamici Clarke DeLauro
 Brady (PA) Clay DelBene
 Braley (IA) Cleaver Edwards
 Brown (FL) Clyburn Eshoo
 Brownley (CA) Cohen
 Bustos Connolly
 Butterfield Conyers Duckworth

Edwards
 Ellison
 Engel
 Enyart
 Eshoo
 Esty
 Farr
 Fattah
 Foster
 Frankel (FL)
 Fudge
 Gabbard
 Gallego
 Garamendi
 García
 Grayson
 Green, Al
 Green, Gene
 Grijalva
 Gutiérrez
 Hahn
 Hanabusa
 Hastings (FL)
 Heck (WA)
 Higgins
 Himes
 Hinojosa
 Holt
 Honda
 Horsford
 Hoyer
 Huffman
 Israel
 Jackson Lee
 Jeffries
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Kaptur
 Keating
 Kelly (IL)
 Kennedy
 Kildee
 Kilmer
 Kind
 Kirkpatrick
 Kuster
 Langevin
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)

Courtney
 Diaz-Balart
 Herrera Beutler
 McCarthy (NY)

Lee (CA)
 Levin
 Lewis
 Lipinski
 Loeb sack
 Lofgren
 Lowenthal
 Lowey
 Lujan Grisham
 (NM)
 Luján, Ben Ray
 (NM)
 Lynch
 Maffei
 Maloney,
 Carolyn
 Maloney, Sean
 Matheson
 Matsui
 McCollum
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McIntyre
 McNerney
 Meeks
 Meng
 Michaud
 Miller, George
 Moore
 Moran
 Murphy (FL)
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Negrete McLeod
 Nolan
 O'Rourke
 Owens
 Pallone
 Pascarell
 Pastor (AZ)
 Payne
 Pelosi
 Peters (CA)
 Peters (MI)
 Peterson
 Pingree (ME)
 Pocan
 Price (NC)
 Quigley

NOT VOTING—11

□ 1338

Mr. VARGAS, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. BARBER, Mrs. CAPPS, Messrs. VEASEY, CUELLAR, and Ms. LOFGREEN changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 231, noes 190, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 464]

AYES—231

Aderholt
 Alexander
 Amash
 Amodei
 Bachmann
 Bachus
 Barletta
 Barr
 Barton
 Benishek
 Bentivolio
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (UT)
 Black
 Blackburn
 Boustany
 Brady (TX)
 Bridenstine
 Brooks (AL)
 Brooks (IN)
 Broun (GA)
 Buchanan
 Buschon
 Burgess
 Calvert
 Camp
 Campbell

Cantor
 Capito
 Carter
 Chabot
 Chaffetz
 Coble
 Coffman
 Cole
 Collins (GA)
 Collins (NY)
 Conaway
 Cook
 Cotton
 Cramer
 Crawford
 Crenshaw
 Culberson
 Daines
 Davis, Rodney
 Denham
 Dent
 DeSantis
 DesJarlais
 Duffy
 Duncan (SC)
 Duncan (TN)
 Ellmers
 Farenthold
 Fincher
 Fitzpatrick
 Fleischmann
 Fleming
 Flores
 Forbes
 Fortenberry
 Foxx
 Franks (AZ)
 Frelinghuysen
 Gardner
 Garrett
 Gerlach
 Gibbs
 Gibson
 Gingrey (GA)
 Gohmert
 Goodlatte
 Gosar
 Gowdy
 Granger
 Graves (GA)
 Graves (MO)
 Griffin (AR)
 Griffith (VA)
 Grimm
 Guthrie
 Hall
 Hanna
 Harper
 Harris
 Hartzler
 Hastings (WA)
 Heck (NV)
 Hensarling
 Holding
 Hudson
 Huelskamp
 Huizenga (MI)
 Hultgren
 Hunter

Andrews
 Barber
 Barrow (GA)
 Bass
 Beatty
 Becerra
 Bera (CA)
 Bishop (GA)
 Bishop (NY)
 Blumenauer
 Bonamici
 Brady (PA)
 Braley (IA)
 Brown (FL)
 Brownley (CA)
 Bustos
 Butterfield
 Capps
 Capuano
 Carney
 Carson (IN)
 Cartwright
 Castor (FL)
 Castro (TX)
 Chu
 Cicilline
 Clarke
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Clyburn
 Cohen
 Connolly
 Conyers
 Cooper
 Costa
 Courtney
 Crowley
 Cuellar
 Cummings
 Davis (CA)
 Davis, Danny
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 Delaney
 DeLauro
 DelBene
 Deutch
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Doyle
 Duckworth
 Edwards
 Ellison
 Engel
 Enyart
 Eshoo

Renacci
 Ribble
 Rice (SC)
 Rigell
 Roby
 Roe (TN)
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rogers (MI)
 Rohrabacher
 Rokita
 Rooney
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam
 Ross
 Rothfus
 Royce
 Runyan
 Ryan (WI)
 Salmon
 Sanford
 Scalise
 Schock
 Schweikert
 Scott, Austin
 Sensenbrenner
 Sessions
 Shimkus
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Southerland
 Stewart
 Stivers
 Stockman
 Stutzman
 Terry
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tiberi
 Tipton
 Turner
 Upton
 Valadao
 Wagner
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walorski
 Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)
 Wenstrup
 Westmoreland
 Whitfield
 Williams
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Wolf
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yoder
 Yoho
 Young (AK)
 Young (FL)
 Young (IN)

NOES—190

Esty
 Farr
 Fattah
 Foster
 Frankel (FL)
 Fudge
 Gabbard
 Gallego
 Garamendi
 García
 Grayson
 Green, Al
 Green, Gene
 Grijalva
 Gutierrez
 Hahn
 Hanabusa
 Hastings (FL)
 Heck (WA)
 Higgins
 Hinojosa
 Holt
 Honda
 Horsford
 Hoyer
 Huffman
 Israel
 Jackson Lee

Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján Grisham
(NM)
Lujan, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern

McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Wilson (FL)
Schakowsky

Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Takano
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Walsh
Wasserman
Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Clea ver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxy
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (MO)

Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCauley
McCollum
McDermott

McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Menger
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neom
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radel
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner

Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southernland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano

Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden

Walorski
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—11

Cárdenas
Cassidy
Diaz-Balart
Herrera Beutler

Himes
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Perlmutter

Polis
Rush
Waters

□ 1345

Ms. SINEMA changed her vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF SPECIAL ENVOY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 301) to provide for the establishment of the Special Envoy to Promote Religious Freedom of Religious Minorities in the Near East and South Central Asia, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 402, nays 22, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 465]

YEAS—402

Aderholt
Alexander
Amodei
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra

Benishak
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)

Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell

Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Clea ver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxy
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (MO)

Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCauley
McCollum
McDermott

McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Menger
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neom
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radel
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner

Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southernland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano

Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden

NAYS—22

Amash
Broun (GA)
Collins (GA)
Graves (GA)
Hudson
Jones
King (IA)
Lummis

Massie
McClintock
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Neugebauer
O'Rourke
Posey
Ribble

Rice (SC)
Sanford
Stutzman
Westmoreland
Woodall
Yoho

NOT VOTING—8

Cassidy
Diaz-Balart
Herrera Beutler

McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Perlmutter

□ 1353

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MINERALS PRODUCTION ACT OF 2013

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 761.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 347 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 761.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1355

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 761) to require the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to more efficiently develop domestic sources of the minerals and mineral materials of strategic and critical importance to United States economic and national security and manufacturing competitiveness, with Mr. FORTENBERRY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in strong support of H.R. 761, the National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act.

Not a day goes by when Americans don't use a product that is made from critical minerals. In fact, life as we know it in the 21st century would not be possible without these minerals. There would be no computers, no Blackberrys or iPhones. There would be no MRI, CAT scan, or X-ray machines. There would be no wind turbines or solar panels. Mr. Chairman, the list is exhaustive of these things that depend on critical minerals that make modern life possible.

Rare-earth elements, a special subset of strategic and critical minerals, are core components of these products in the 21st century. Yet despite the tremendous need for rare-earth elements, the United States has allowed itself to become almost entirely dependent on China and other foreign nations for these resources.

America has a plentiful supply of rare-earth elements, but roadblocks to the development of these crucial materials have resulted in China producing 97 percent of the world's supply. Our current policies are handing China a monopoly on these elements, creating a dependence that has serious implications on American jobs, on our economy, and on our national security.

Burdensome red tape, duplicative reviews, frivolous lawsuits, and onerous regulations can hold up new mining projects here in the U.S. for more than 10 years. These unnecessary delays cost American jobs as we become more and more dependent on foreign countries for these raw ingredients. The lack of America-produced strategic and critical produced minerals are prime examples of how America has regulated itself into a 100 percent dependence on at least 19 unique minerals. It has also earned the United States the unfortunate distinction of being ranked dead last when it comes to permitting mining projects. In 2012, the U.S. was ranked last, along with Papua New Guinea, out of 25 major mining countries on the pace of permitting. Mr. Chairman, I can't speak for Papua New Guinea, but the reason the U.S. Government is so slow to issue new mining permits is very simple: government bureaucracy.

H.R. 761, introduced by our colleague from Nevada, Mr. AMODEI, will help us to end the foreign dependence by streamlining government red tape that blocks America's strategic and critical mineral production. Instead of waiting

for over a decade for mining permits to be approved, this bill sets a goal of total review process for permitting at 30 months.

□ 1400

Now this isn't a hard deadline, Mr. Chairman. It can be extended. But it is a goal to push the bureaucrats into action on these important infrastructure projects. It shouldn't take a decade to get a project built for minerals that we need in our everyday life and for our national security.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, above all, this is a jobs bill. The positive economic impact of this bill will extend beyond just the mining industry. For every metal mining job created, an estimated 2.3 additional jobs are generated. And for every nonmetal mining job created, another 1.6 jobs are created.

This legislation gives the opportunity for American manufacturers, small businesses, technology companies, and construction firms to use American resources to help make the products that are essential to our everyday lives.

As China continues to tighten global supplies of rare-earth elements, we should respond with an American mineral mining renaissance that will bring mining and manufacturing jobs back to America. The National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act is important to our jobs and to our economy. We must act now to cut the government red tape that is stopping American mineral production and furthering our dependence on foreign minerals.

And with that, Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Today we are considering H.R. 761, the so-called National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act of 2013. Now, despite the bill's title, it has almost nothing to do with national strategic and critical minerals production. In fact, under the guise of promoting the development of minerals critical to the United States' national security, this legislation would reshape mining decisions on public lands for almost all minerals.

Mr. Chairman, the bill's classification of "critical minerals" is so broad that even sand and gravel and other such things can fall under its definition. Critical and strategic minerals? The Democratic amendments we will consider today will attempt to tailor this legislation to cover only minerals that are truly critical and strategic and will address the egregious provisions that would truncate important environmental review.

Make no mistake, this bill is a giveaway. It is free mining, no royalties, no protection of public interest, exemption from royalty payments, near exemption from environmental regulations, near exemption from legal enforcement of the protections. And it's unnecessary.

There is a real debate that we could be having about the mining laws in this country. It should start with reforming the mining law of 1872, which is as archaic as its name suggests—the mining law of 1872. We should be discussing abandoned mine reclamation. We should be discussing ensuring taxpayers a fair return on industrial development of our public lands.

Mr. Chairman, in the Natural Resources Committee markup on May 15 of this year where H.R. 761 was reported out on a nearly party line vote, the committee also reported two other bills on a bipartisan basis, two other bills that would lay the groundwork for developing critical and strategic mineral production. Those bills, H.R. 1063, the National Strategic and Critical Minerals Policy Act of 2013, and H.R. 981, the RARE Act, were unanimously reported out of the Natural Resources Committee and legitimately would be worth debating here in the House as part of any serious effort to improve our understanding of critical strategic mineral deposits and to aid in their development.

We reported out bills on a bipartisan basis that would do what this legislation purports to do. We could be discussing those bills. Instead, we're taking up legislation which is a giveaway. The legislation we could be dealing with would actually deal with strategic and critical minerals. Now, if the majority were to bring it to the floor, I'm sure it would pass in an overwhelming, bipartisan way and would likely be passed by the other body and signed into law. In fact, in the last Congress, the National Strategic and Critical Minerals Policy Act—not to be confused with the Production Act that we are considering today—was supported by the National Mining Association.

The president and CEO of the National Mining Association issued a statement when that bill passed out of committee last Congress, and he said: "The House Natural Resources Committee took important bipartisan action today to ensure U.S. manufacturers, technology innovators, and our military have a more stable supply of minerals vital to the products they produce and use." He went on to say that legislation, "will provide a valuable assessment of our current and future mineral demands and our ability to meet more of our needs through domestic minerals production."

We could be considering legislation like that.

We should be able to work in a bipartisan fashion when it comes to improving our supply of rare-earth minerals and other strategic minerals and ensuring that we are not dependent on China and other nations for their supply. But the majority seems to be not interested in that. Evidently, they don't want to work in a bipartisan fashion to produce legislation that all sides out there in the country, in industry, people who look after public lands and the environment could agree on. Instead, they're

moving this bill, H.R. 761, which has almost nothing to do with strategic minerals, is really about giveaways to the mining industry.

This bill would be a Trojan horse if it were to become law; however, it has no chance of becoming law. Maybe the American people should be grateful we won't pass this giveaway, that the American people—I say, those American people who don't stand to get rich by this mining giveaway.

But can the American people really feel good that we're wasting time and actually not looking after the critical and strategic minerals that American products, American defense depends on? Why are we playing these games? Why, I should say, are they playing these games with our legitimate needs to develop strategic minerals? We should be working in the kind of fashion that led to last year's bill.

The majority should shelf this giveaway to the mining industry and bring to the floor serious proposals that we could honestly debate as part of a legitimate bipartisan discussion regarding rare-earth policy and supply.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. AMODEI), the author of this legislation.

Mr. AMODEI. Mr. Chairman, having a real debate on this issue is something that I wholeheartedly support.

We probably ought to start with the facts. First of all, you've heard much about the overly broad definition. H.R. 761 deliberately contains a broad definition of strategic and critical minerals. Here are some of the reasons why:

In 2006, prior to the worldwide economic downturn, there was great concern over the future availability of platinum, group metals, and copper. At the time, projections in demand for copper indicated that by 2016, 30 large-scale copper deposits would have to come online to meet worldwide demand. At the time, there were not enough copper deposits in the permitting pipeline to make up for the projected downward curve.

And you have heard much about sand and gravel. Even sand and gravel and other construction mineral materials can be in short supply or not available, as the USGS discovered in 2009 during the great California shakeout. What they discovered during that was that, in its assessment of scope and damage and materials needed for construction in the event of a large-scale earthquake, USGS discovered there were not enough sand, gravel, and other construction materials available in the region to meet the affected area's reconstruction needs.

So when you talk about the ability to foretell the future and you say, well, we should just limit things to the i-um ending minerals, I say you probably ought to think about what it takes to get a bill through Congress to respond

to those things because it's less timely than the Federal permitting process.

Much has been made about getting rid of NEPA review. You know, when all else fails, read the bill. Take a look at page 7. And when you look at lines 4 through 9 there, these are not the words that you would be using if you were trying to get rid of the NEPA process. Starting up at page 6, line 24, it says, "The lead agency with responsibility for" permitting. Then you go down to page 7, line 5, it says, "if the procedural and substantive safeguards of the permitting process alone," they must find that those are there. Look at line 5, "if the procedural" are found. That is unlimited discretion in an executive branch agency.

So don't tell me that we're getting rid of NEPA, because the bill would have been written differently if we were trying to get rid of NEPA.

I want to also point your attention to the base of this is an infrastructure executive order from the current administration that talks about avoiding duplication of efforts. I also want to point out some words in there. It says, "infrastructure projects in sectors, including surface transportation"—oh, by the way, I think that has something to do with sand and gravel—"aviation"—runways I think have some of those elements that people don't think are critical—"ports, waterways, water resource projects, renewable energy generation, electricity transmission, broadband, pipelines"—hello, Keystone. See how good it's done them.

If this is an attempt to skirt environmental regulations, somebody probably should have written it differently. We didn't. It is simply not the truth.

And I want to talk about fair return on all this taxation stuff. In my State, which is 85 percent owned by the Federal Government, the Federal Government gives \$22 million a year to the rural counties in Nevada for PILT. And I know some of my colleagues from east of the Mississippi don't understand what that acronym means. It's payment in lieu of taxes, \$22 million. What this bill is really about is about jobs.

The final piece is this. This does not require anybody in the Federal permitting agencies to say, Yes, you can have your permit in 30 months. It requires an answer in 30 months. Nobody seeks to apply this to get a nice, crisp "no" in 30 months, which is why the language is in there, Mr. Chairman, that says, by the way, if both sides agree, you can have longer to process it.

Now, when you bounce that off the claims of 3½ and 5 years, under existing administration permitting timelines, asking them to set a 30-month timeline is not something which undoes environmental responsibility, rapes the landscape, and outdoes the taxpayers out of their normal revenues that are there.

Mr. HOLT. May I inquire of the time remaining, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey has 23½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HOLT. I thank the Chair, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Well, I will repeat. This bill is a giveaway. It is free mining, no royalties. I referred to the archaic legislation that goes by the archaic name of the Mining Act of 1872 which excuses miners from royalty payments. That would apply here.

And as for excusing the miners from environmental regulations, the legislation says that the lead agency shall determine that a major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of human environment has not occurred or is not occurring. In other words, the mining activities are excluded from, excused from, the triggering language of the Environmental Policy Act. No significant environmental policy review would be undertaken under the National Environmental Policy Act if the agency can say, Well, the State is doing something; the State is doing something, whatever that may be, however adequate that may turn out to be.

So I call that a relaxation, if not an exemption, of environmental protection. And I repeat, these mining activities do not allow for a fair return to the taxpayer, the owners of this land, for the use of this land.

□ 1415

And under this, we could call anything at all strategic and critical. Yeah, sometimes the military might need to build a runway or extend a runway, but to say that the sand and gravel that's necessary to do that becomes strategic is a real perversion of the idea of strategic and critical.

So let's deal with those things that we need for aircraft engines and powerful magnets, lanthanum and neodymium and gadolinium and dysprosium and these other so-called rare-earth elements, some of which are actually not so rare, but they're dispersed and, therefore, hard to mine and hard to get adequate quantities of them and some of which are truly rare.

Let's deal with the legislation that makes those available for manufacturing needs, for national security needs, rather than having a catch-all mining definition that excuses any kind of mining from royalties and from environmental regulation.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I'm very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH), a new member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I commend the Congressman for recognizing the need to correct a major supply chain vulnerability in the United States, that of critical and strategic minerals.

Many of us in Congress only heard of the concept of strategic minerals after

we became lawmakers. Most of the time, we hear about exotic elements at the bottom of the periodic table like neodymium and europium, but the fact is that we are facing down potentially devastating supply disruptions for a much more familiar material, lead.

In my district, we know a lot about lead because my district produces more lead than any other district in the Nation. We rely on lead for everything from bullets, missiles, ships and tanks, to batteries for vehicles and energy storage, to TV and computer screens, to storing nuclear waste. Almost every one of us drives a car powered by a lead-acid battery.

It may be hard to believe that lead could be a strategic vulnerability for the United States because we have used it in so many products for over a century. Over the past generation, we have taken lead out of things like gasoline and paint to help protect human health.

But the fact is lead is still crucial as a critical material that we use safely in a vast number of American-manufactured technologies. There is only one primary lead producer remaining in the United States today, and that facility is scheduled to close at the end of 2013. And environmental regulations are making it more and more difficult for lead producers to extract and process economically.

Today, China produces three times the lead that the United States produces, and our global market share is shrinking. At the same time, global demand for lead is expected to grow by 5 to 6 percent a year, increasing prices and competition for our domestic resources.

American innovators are working hard to improve the efficiency of lead production and make sure as many lead-acid batteries as possible are recycled so their contents can be repurposed. But the U.S. simply cannot meet its national security needs and commercialize important new technologies without a more robust, secure supply.

I hope that H.R. 761 will open doors for lead production in the United States, and that any future legislative efforts on critical minerals will also account for lead supplies.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This legislation is fundamentally a solution in search of a problem. Now, according to analysis of data provided by the Bureau of Land Management for hardrock mines on public lands, for which there is complete data, the average time it takes to approve a plan of operation for a mine has actually decreased under the Obama administration. We do not need a relaxation of regulations in order to speed things up.

According to the BLM data, plans of operation for hardrock mines are being approved roughly 17 percent more quickly under the Obama administration than under the previous administration. Thank you, President Obama.

And despite the majority's claims, 82 percent of plans of operation for hardrock mines are approved within 3 years under the Obama administration.

Now, the mining company will say, oh, 3 years, that's so long. Well, according to the BLM "it takes, on average, 4 years to approve a mining plan of operation for a large mine, more than 1,000 acres on public lands."

Now, my colleagues on the other side have asked repeatedly what the problem is with their legislation that would truncate and eviscerate proper review of all mines on public lands if the majority of plans are approved within 3 years.

Well, it's because a little more than 15 percent of hardrock mines take more than 4 years to approve. For these mines, where mining companies may not have submitted a complete application, or may not have posted sufficient bond to ensure that the mine is cleaned up after the work, or where additional environmental review is required because the mine is large or potentially damaging to our environment and to public health, this bill would prevent proper review.

We're already approving hardrock mines more quickly under the current administration than under the previous administration. We should not be eviscerating proper review of virtually all mining operations on public lands, including sand and gravel, I repeat, as this Republican bill would do. We should certainly not be doing it under the pretense of developing critical and strategic minerals.

Now, the other side likes to cherry-pick. They cherry-pick one statistic out of a report, without having, apparently, read the rest of the report.

If you look at the full report by the international consulting firm Behre Dolbear, it states that "permitting delays are a global issue" and that "the business environment will likely favor firms that aggressively take a proactive stance concerning societal and environmental issues."

Plans under the current administration, under the current BLM, plans of operation for hardrock mines are being approved roughly 17 percent more quickly than previously.

They say that the United States is last, ranked last, in mining. No. What they fail to note is this very report says that the United States is one of the most attractive countries in the world for mining, sixth, to be precise, sixth most attractive. We are number six in the world when you take all factors into consideration and all countries into consideration.

Yet my colleagues on the other side of the aisle continue to cherry-pick and say that the United States is so unfair to the mining interests that we have to give them a break, that we have to give away all of these mining resources on the public's lands, with no royalties and very few questions asked.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Missouri) assumed the chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Sherman Williams, one of his secretaries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

NATIONAL STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MINERALS PRODUCTION ACT OF 2013

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I'm very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. AMODEI).

Mr. AMODEI. Mr. Chairman, only in Washington would we be having a debate about whether 4 years is okay or 2½ years is okay when we're talking about a jobs bill. And only in Washington would we talk about cherry-picking when we're talking about the vast majority of the production that is sought for permitting, and the vast number of jobs that is created is not—I want to make this very clear so the record is clear—is not handled within 3 years.

Now, it may be true that it's less than the Bush administration, which is fine. Let's assume that it is.

But when you're talking about primarily issues that deal with Western lands whose States are at or near a majority of Federal ownership, and you want to talk about the middle class, and you want to talk about generating jobs, and you want to say, hey, by the way, you can take as long as you want; we don't know if you're going to have a job in that industry or not because there are no rules.

Only in Washington would we be defending no time limits whatsoever. To say 30 months is a bad idea, with language that says, if both sides agree, you can take longer, is not an unreasonable environmental or administrative stance.

Nobody wants a nice, crisp denial in 30 months; and by the way, if the application should be denied, then I presume that it will be denied.

But what we're seeing now, and you can find no legislative history for this anywhere in any of the applicable environmental regulations and statutes, of which all still apply, there is nothing that says, by the way, if nothing else works, just see if you can drag it out as long as possible and hope that that capital goes away. Because when you talk about permitting attractiveness, it's not what these folks are those folks say, it's where the capital goes. And the capital isn't going here.

And the strategic interest of having to go to China for your rare-earths or having to go to other countries to produce those is not apparent.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

My friend on the other side of the aisle says that, evidently, the agencies that are reviewing these massive projects, projects that can permanently degrade the environment, permanently degrade the environment, hurt public health, affect communities, they're doing it just to be mean to the mining interests.

No, I don't think so. They are charged with protecting the lands that belong to Americans, the health of Americans, and the long-term welfare of the communities.

Now, as for China, let's talk about China. We should be talking about China. We should be concerned about what happens to the rare-earth minerals around the world and in this country being locked up by China.

Talk to any business searching the venture capital community for start-up funding, and one of the first things that they will be asked is, what is your China plan, because if you don't have a China plan, you won't be very successful.

The bill that we're considering today, once again, shows that Republicans, in their eagerness to have giveaways for the mining industry, are wandering in total darkness when it comes to developing a strategy for dealing with China.

In the Findings section of the bill before us it says:

The industrialization of China and India has driven demand for nonfuel mineral commodities, sparking a period of resource nationalism exemplified by China's reduction in exports of rare-earth elements.

True. And these are the rare-earth elements that are necessary for telecommunications and military technologies and health care technologies and conventional energy and renewable energy technologies.

So what would this bill do about China's export restrictions?

What would this bill do to ensure that China not restrict exports of rare-earths to us, or that we keep the rare-earth elements in this country to be used as strategic input to these strategic industries?

Nothing.

I have news for my colleagues. We do, in the United States, produce rare-earth. We mine and concentrate rare-earth elements. The Molycorp facility in California mines one of the richest rare-earth deposits in the world. They're ramping up to 40,000 tons of production by next year. That will be a quarter of the global production.

□ 1430

But guess what? Guess where they are sending much of that production? Yes, China. That's right. Our rare-earths will go to China to be refined into alloys and metals. And there they will stay, if the Chinese Government so determines, for Chinese high-tech manufacturers. What are we doing about that in this legislation? Nothing.

So why are we doing this legislation first when the bigger problem is how are we going to have a reliable supply of these strategic minerals.

The Republican solution is, China, we waived our environmental laws. We're going to turn these out faster and faster from these public lands that belong to the American people. We'll send them to you, China, so you can refine them. And please send them back to us.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I would ask my friend from New Jersey if he has any further speakers. I'm prepared to close if the gentleman is prepared to close.

Mr. HOLT. I have no further speakers, and I yield myself the remaining time.

In closing, let me just repeat what we've heard over and over. This is unnecessary. It's not dealing with the real problems first. It is a giveaway to the mining industry to exempt them from regulations, to exempt them from paying a reasonable royalty to the American people for use of the American people's lands. It would alter nearly all mining operations on public lands in the United States by reducing or even eliminating review under the National Environmental Policy Act. It would change these mining operations not just for these rare-earth elements but for copper, uranium, sand, and gravel.

The Interior Department testified this legislation would remove many of the environmental safeguards for almost all types of hardrock mines on public lands, bypass evaluation of potential impacts under the National Environmental Policy Act, and limit public involvement in agency decision-making.

Can that be a good idea—to eliminate all those things and not actually deal with the production and supply and availability of strategic minerals?

The authors of the bill say it's needed "because it could take a developer years to get all government permits in place." Well, that's up to the developer to get those in. And it's up to the government agencies to make sure they do it in a way that protects the public health, protects the public lands, protects the future of communities that would be affected by this.

This bill is not about fixing delays, but really about preventing proper environmental review and safety and public health reviews.

We should be updating the Mining Act of 1872. We are a century or a century-and-a-half late in updating that mining law. Maybe there was a time in the 19th century where we wanted to send people out to develop the great expanses of the western United States and give them carte blanche. We've come a long way since then.

We should get up to date here in the House of Representatives. We should be dealing with the hundred thousand known abandoned mines that are a danger to people and to the environ-

ment. Promoting the development of minerals that are critical to core national priorities and that are genuinely susceptible to disruptions should be an area where both sides, Republicans and Democrats, can work together. Instead, we're dealing with special interests, giving them free rein in a handout.

I urge my colleagues to reject this misguided bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, before I make my closing remarks, I want to thank Chairman GOODLATTE of the Judiciary Committee for his cooperation in helping schedule this bill for consideration. We have an exchange of letters to that effect.

Mr. Chairman, much has been debated here on the floor about what is strategic and what is not strategic. Let me posit a suggestion here on the fact that there are two ways that you could define this. You could define it by making a definition so narrow that in effect the legislation picks winners and losers. Or you could write statutory law that says that certain conditions that require certain elements will be the driver of what is strategic. That means the marketplace is the one, then, that decides what is strategic. I think that's a much better approach because when I talk about this, I recall hearing that in the late 1890s the U.S. Patent Office issued a statement—and I could be off a little bit—saying that we ought to close down the U.S. Patent Office because everything that has been invented, has been invented. This is in the 1890s. This is before we were flying airplanes. This is before the car became commercially available. This means all the minerals that go into those things weren't even thought of at the time.

So what we do then in this bill is just very straightforward. We say that the strategic minerals will meet these criteria. By the way, you can find this on page 5, section 3, "Definitions":

(A) For national defense and national security.

That is so self-evident, it hardly needs to be debated.

Second:

For the Nation's energy infrastructure, including pipelines, refining.

That's from an energy standpoint. That certainly should not be debated because we have to have a good energy source if we're going to have a growing economy.

And:

(C) To support domestic manufacturing.

Of course, that includes agriculture and housing. In other words, to support our economy. Doesn't that make good sense to have a source of strategic minerals for that?

Finally:

(D) for the Nation's economic security and balance of trade.

That makes eminently good sense because we are seriously out of balance

now with China, as has been brought up.

So this approach is more of a long-term solution because I dare say that 25 years from now there will be a mineral that somebody will find that will be used for new technology. But if we have defined it so narrowly that we don't know what that technology is, we have in fact been picking winners and losers. That's the wrong approach. The right approach is what's embodied in this bill to say that these conditions will be the ones that will define strategic minerals.

Finally, let me close on this: everybody likes to make fun of sand and gravel as being strategic. I guarantee you that after the earthquakes in northern and southern California, when the freeways collapsed, I can tell you very, very strategically that cement and sand and gravel fit that category.

So under the conditions, I think this fits what we are attempting to do in the long term.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 28, 2013.

Hon. DOC HASTINGS,
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources,
Longworth House Office Building, Wash-
ington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HASTINGS, I am writing with respect to H.R. 761, the "National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act of 2013," which the Committee on Natural Resources reported favorably. As a result of your having consulted with us on provisions in H.R. 761 that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary, I agree to discharge our Committee from further consideration of this bill so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration.

The Judiciary Committee takes this action with our mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 761 at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that our Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as the bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues in our jurisdiction. Our Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, and asks that you support any such request.

I would appreciate a response to this letter confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 761, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during Floor consideration of H.R. 761.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 3, 2013.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, Ray-
burn HOB, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 761, the National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act of 2013. As you know, the Committee on Natural Resources ordered reported the bill, as amended, on May 15, 2013. I appreciate your support in bringing this legislation before the House of Representatives, and accord-

ingly, understand that the Committee on the Judiciary will forego action on the bill.

The Committee on Natural Resources concurs with the mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 761 at this time, the Committee on the Judiciary does not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation. In addition, should a conference on the bill be necessary, I would support your request to have the Committee on the Judiciary represented on the conference committee. Finally, I would be pleased to include your letter and this response in the bill report filed by the Committee on Natural Resources, as well as in the Congressional Record during floor consideration, to memorialize our understanding.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

DOC HASTING,
Chairman.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, while I strongly support efforts to enhance our domestic security by reducing our reliance on foreign sources of strategic and critical minerals, but aside from its short title, the pending legislation has nothing to do with that goal.

In fact, this legislation provides relief to any and all types of minerals on public lands—minerals such as gold, silver and copper produced under the Mining Law of 1872.

These are minerals that are mined for free, with no royalty charged in return for their removal from lands owned by all Americans.

Yet, the pending legislation would provide multi-national conglomerates with even more relief in their pursuit of mining free gold from federal lands.

It is not limited in scope to, for instance, rare earth minerals used in fuel cells and solar panels among other applications. Rare earths are certainly strategic and critical.

Instead, the bill provides relief to any "mineral exploration or mine permit" with plans of operations issued by the BLM under its 3809 regulation and the Forest Service under its counterpart regulations.

Read the bill. Look up those regulations.

The BLM 3809 regulations are clear, they apply to "all operations authorized by the mining laws on public lands where the mineral interest is reserved to the United States."

The Forest Service regulations referenced in the bill state they apply to "the surface of National Forest System lands in connections with operations authorized by the United States mining laws . . ."

So I say to my colleagues, understand what you will be voting on. Understand that this bill provides additional relief to mostly foreign owned companies who are extracting gold, silver and other hardrock minerals from our lands, our public lands, without paying a royalty in return.

Mine coal on federal lands, you pay a royalty. Drill for oil and natural gas on public lands, you pay a royalty. But not gold, not silver, and not copper.

I oppose this legislation.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources, printed in the bill, shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered read.

The text of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 761

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act of 2013".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) *The industrialization of China and India has driven demand for nonfuel mineral commodities, sparking a period of resource nationalism exemplified by China's reduction in exports of rare-earth elements necessary for telecommunications, military technologies, healthcare technologies, and conventional and renewable energy technologies.*

(2) *The availability of minerals and mineral materials are essential for economic growth, national security, technological innovation, and the manufacturing and agricultural supply chain.*

(3) *The exploration, production, processing, use, and recycling of minerals contribute significantly to the economic well-being, security and general welfare of the Nation.*

(4) *The United States has vast mineral resources, but is becoming increasingly dependent upon foreign sources of these mineral materials, as demonstrated by the following:*

(A) *Twenty-five years ago the United States was dependent on foreign sources for 30 nonfuel mineral materials, 6 of which the United States imported 100 percent of the Nation's requirements, and for another 16 commodities the United States imported more than 60 percent of the Nation's needs.*

(B) *By 2011 the United States import dependence for nonfuel mineral materials had more than doubled from 30 to 67 commodities, 19 of which the United States imported 100 percent of the Nation's requirements, and for another 24 commodities, imported more than 50 percent of the Nation's needs.*

(C) *The United States share of worldwide mineral exploration dollars was 8 percent in 2011, down from 19 percent in the early 1990s.*

(D) *In the 2012 Ranking of Countries for Mining Investment, out of 25 major mining countries, the United States ranked last with Papua New Guinea in permitting delays, and towards the bottom regarding government take and social issues affecting mining.*

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MINERALS.**—The term "strategic and critical minerals" means minerals that are necessary—

(A) *for national defense and national security requirements;*

(B) *for the Nation's energy infrastructure, including pipelines, refining capacity, electrical power generation and transmission, and renewable energy production;*

(C) *to support domestic manufacturing, agriculture, housing, telecommunications, healthcare, and transportation infrastructure; or*

(D) *for the Nation's economic security and balance of trade.*

(2) **AGENCY.**—The term "agency" means any agency, department, or other unit of Federal, State, local, or tribal government, or Alaska Native Corporation.

(3) **MINERAL EXPLORATION OR MINE PERMIT.**—The term "mineral exploration or mine permit" includes plans of operation issued by the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service pursuant to 43 C.F.R. 3809 and 36 C.F.R. 228A or the authorities listed in 43 C.F.R. 3503.13, respectively.

TITLE I—DEVELOPMENT OF DOMESTIC SOURCES OF STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MINERALS

SEC. 101. IMPROVING DEVELOPMENT OF STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MINERALS.

Domestic mines that will provide strategic and critical minerals shall be considered an “infrastructure project” as described in Presidential Order “Improving Performance of Federal Permitting and Review of Infrastructure Projects” dated March 22, 2012.

SEC. 102. RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE LEAD AGENCY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The lead agency with responsibility for issuing a mineral exploration or mine permit shall appoint a project lead who shall coordinate and consult with cooperating agencies and any other agency involved in the permitting process, project proponents and contractors to ensure that agencies minimize delays, set and adhere to timelines and schedules for completion of the permitting process, set clear permitting goals and track progress against those goals.

(b) **DETERMINATION UNDER NEPA.**—To the extent that the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 applies to any mineral exploration or mine permit, the lead agency with responsibility for issuing a mineral exploration or mine permit shall determine that the action to approve the exploration or mine permit does not constitute a major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment within the meaning of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 if the procedural and substantive safeguards of the permitting process alone, any applicable State permitting process alone, or a combination of the two processes together provide an adequate mechanism to ensure that environmental factors are taken into account.

(c) **COORDINATION ON PERMITTING PROCESS.**—The lead agency with responsibility for issuing a mineral exploration or mine permit shall enhance government coordination for the permitting process by avoiding duplicative reviews, minimizing paperwork and engaging other agencies and stakeholders early in the process. The lead agency shall consider the following best practices:

(1) Deferring to and relying upon baseline data, analyses and reviews performed by State agencies with jurisdiction over the proposed project.

(2) Conducting any consultations or reviews concurrently rather than sequentially to the extent practicable and when such concurrent review will expedite rather than delay a decision.

(d) **SCHEDULE FOR PERMITTING PROCESS.**—At the request of a project proponent, the lead agency, cooperating agencies and any other agencies involved with the mineral exploration or mine permitting process shall enter into an agreement with the project proponent that sets time limits for each part of the permitting process including the following:

(1) The decision on whether to prepare a document required under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

(2) A determination of the scope of any document required under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

(3) The scope of and schedule for the baseline studies required to prepare a document required under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

(4) Preparation of any draft document required under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

(5) Preparation of a final document required under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

(6) Consultations required under applicable laws.

(7) Submission and review of any comments required under applicable law.

(8) Publication of any public notices required under applicable law.

(9) A final or any interim decisions.

(e) **TIME LIMIT FOR PERMITTING PROCESS.**—In no case should the total review process described in subsection (d) exceed 30 months unless agreed to by the signatories of the agreement.

(f) **LIMITATION ON ADDRESSING PUBLIC COMMENTS.**—The lead agency is not required to address agency or public comments that were not submitted during any public comment periods or consultation periods provided during the permitting process or as otherwise required by law.

(g) **FINANCIAL ASSURANCE.**—The lead agency will determine the amount of financial assurance for reclamation of a mineral exploration or mining site, which must cover the estimated cost if the lead agency were to contract with a third party to reclaim the operations according to the reclamation plan, including construction and maintenance costs for any treatment facilities necessary to meet Federal, State or tribal environmental standards.

(h) **APPLICATION TO EXISTING PERMIT APPLICATIONS.**—This section shall apply with respect to a mineral exploration or mine permit for which an application was submitted before the date of the enactment of this Act if the applicant for the permit submits a written request to the lead agency for the permit. The lead agency shall begin implementing this section with respect to such application within 30 days after receiving such written request.

(i) **STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MINERALS WITHIN NATIONAL FORESTS.**—With respect to strategic and critical minerals within a federally administered unit of the National Forest System, the lead agency shall—

(1) exempt all areas of identified mineral resources in Land Use Designations, other than Non-Development Land Use Designations, in existence as of the date of the enactment of this Act from the procedures detailed at and all rules promulgated under part 294 of title 36, Code for Federal Regulations;

(2) apply such exemption to all additional routes and areas that the lead agency finds necessary to facilitate the construction, operation, maintenance, and restoration of the areas of identified mineral resources described in paragraph (1); and

(3) continue to apply such exemptions after approval of the Minerals Plan of Operations for the unit of the National Forest System.

SEC. 103. CONSERVATION OF THE RESOURCE.

In evaluating and issuing any mineral exploration or mine permit, the priority of the lead agency shall be to maximize the development of the mineral resource, while mitigating environmental impacts, so that more of the mineral resource can be brought to the market place.

SEC. 104. FEDERAL REGISTER PROCESS FOR MINERAL EXPLORATION AND MINING PROJECTS.

(a) **PREPARATION OF FEDERAL NOTICES FOR MINERAL EXPLORATION AND MINE DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS.**—The preparation of Federal Register notices required by law associated with the issuance of a mineral exploration or mine permit shall be delegated to the organization level within the agency responsible for issuing the mineral exploration or mine permit. All Federal Register notices regarding official document availability, announcements of meetings, or notices of intent to undertake an action shall be originated and transmitted to the Federal Register from the office where documents are held, meetings are held, or the activity is initiated.

(b) **DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW OF FEDERAL REGISTER NOTICES FOR MINERAL EXPLORATION AND MINING PROJECTS.**—Absent any extraordinary circumstance or except as otherwise required by any Act of Congress, each Federal Register notice described in subsection (a) shall undergo any required reviews within the Department of the Interior or the Department of Agriculture and be published in its final form in the Federal Register no later than 30 days after its initial preparation.

TITLE II—JUDICIAL REVIEW OF AGENCY ACTIONS RELATING TO EXPLORATION AND MINE PERMITS

SEC. 201. DEFINITIONS FOR TITLE.

In this title the term “covered civil action” means a civil action against the Federal Government containing a claim under section 702 of title 5, United States Code, regarding agency action affecting a mineral exploration or mine permit.

SEC. 202. TIMELY FILINGS.

A covered civil action is barred unless filed no later than the end of the 60-day period beginning on the date of the final Federal agency action to which it relates.

SEC. 203. RIGHT TO INTERVENE.

The holder of any mineral exploration or mine permit may intervene as of right in any covered civil action by a person affecting rights or obligations of the permit holder under the permit.

SEC. 204. EXPEDITION IN HEARING AND DETERMINING THE ACTION.

The court shall endeavor to hear and determine any covered civil action as expeditiously as possible.

SEC. 205. LIMITATION ON PROSPECTIVE RELIEF.

In a covered civil action, the court shall not grant or approve any prospective relief unless the court finds that such relief is narrowly drawn, extends no further than necessary to correct the violation of a legal requirement, and is the least intrusive means necessary to correct that violation.

SEC. 206. LIMITATION ON ATTORNEYS' FEES.

Sections 504 of title 5, United States Code, and 2412 of title 28, United States Code (together commonly called the Equal Access to Justice Act) do not apply to a covered civil action, nor shall any party in such a covered civil action receive payment from the Federal Government for their attorneys' fees, expenses, and other court costs.

The CHAIR. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in House Report 113–214. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. LOWENTHAL

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 113–214.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 5, strike lines 3 through 16 and insert the following:

(1) **STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MINERALS.**—The term “strategic and critical minerals”—

(A) means—

(i) minerals and mineral groups identified as critical by the National Research Council in the report entitled “Minerals, Critical Minerals, and the U.S. Economy”, dated 2008; and

(ii) additional minerals identified by the Secretary of the Interior based on the National Research Council criteria in such report; and

(B) shall not include sand, gravel, or clay.

Page 5, strike lines 21 through 26 and insert the following:

(3) MINERAL EXPLORATION OR MINE PERMIT.—The term “mineral exploration or mine permit” —

(A) means a mineral exploration or mine permit for strategic and critical minerals; and

(B) includes any plan of operation for strategic and critical minerals that is issued by the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 347, the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chair, I was puzzled when I read the bill title, the National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act, and then went on to read the bill text. Surely there must have been a mistake when drafting this bill. Strategic and critical minerals were certainly not meant to include sand, gravel, and clay.

But right now, section 3 of this bill is written so broadly that it would include very common nonstrategic and noncritical minerals—even going so far, as I mentioned, to encompass materials such as sand, gravel, and clay.

The Interior Department recently testified before my colleagues on the Natural Resources Committee and confirmed that this is, in fact, exactly the case. The bill that we are now considering is written expansively beyond critical minerals.

The Interior Department testified:

This legislation would remove many of the environmental safeguards for almost all kinds of hardrock mines on public lands, bypassing evaluation of potential impacts under NEPA, and limit public involvement in agency decisionmaking.

That's why I introduce an amendment that would simply narrow the bill's definition of purported strategic and critical minerals to actual strategic and critical minerals, as defined by the National Research Council.

Why is my amendment critical? It is because instead of ostensibly fast-tracking only strategic and critical minerals, which this bill I think does poorly, this legislation appears to be a guise for mining interests to loosen public review, judicial review, and environmental protections not just for strategic and critical minerals, but for all hardrock mining.

We could have a debate about how to ensure America's supply of strategic and critical minerals, but first we have to get the definition right.

I urge the adoption of my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment really picks up on what my arguments were at the end of the general debate

because the effect of this amendment would be to pick winners and losers by narrowly defining a use. And as I stated in my closing remarks, we have four categories that I think are very broad and change over a period of time.

So what this amendment does is try to restrict what may be decided as a critical mineral. Of course, that will change over time. If this amendment is adopted—and I, obviously, urge rejection of this amendment—but if it were to be adopted, I can make a prediction that I know would come back, and that is we'll be back here in the future saying there's another set of critical minerals that we need to define. And we keep doing that over and over and over. Isn't it much better to define the categories and then apply those minerals to those categories? Because they will change.

I find it kind of interesting, too, Mr. Chairman, because I closed my general debate remarks by talking about sand and gravel. My good friend from southern California, I guess, alluded to the fact that sand and gravel don't fit into that category. I'm not going to ask him to answer me, but I'll just ask the question rhetorically, I wonder if he felt that way after the earthquake collapsed freeways in southern California. Would he have liked to wait maybe 4 years for the permitting process to get sand and gravel in order to build those freeways that are so important to southern California?

I asked that question rhetorically, of course, Mr. Chairman.

□ 1445

But I just want to say that this amendment would do exactly opposite of what the intent of this bill is about, and that is that it picks winners and losers. I urge its rejection, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. I welcome those comments, but let's be real clear what I'm talking about. I am talking about eliminating a giveaway of almost all hard rock mining, to really defining what is strategic and critical as defined by the robust methodology in the National Research Council's report.

Now, what do I mean by a robust methodology? It says if we look at all the mining that we have, if we look at what we have to define as strategic, we have to look along two dimensions in a scientific way. We have to know: What is the impact of this mineral or this mining if there was a supply restriction? What would be the impact if there was a supply restriction? Would it impact defense? Would it impact national security? If it does have an impact, then it has a high rating on that.

Also, what about the supply risk? We need to measure, if we do not develop this mine at this place, are there other places that we can? If, in fact, a mineral has high supply risk, high impact, not only are those minerals defined now, but the Secretary of the Interior, using this methodology, will define. This clearly defines what is needed in

terms of strategic and critical, and not just everything.

I remind you that right now we are loosening in the bill the environmental protections, public participation, judicial review for everything. We're doing it, as was pointed out, for national defense, he said, anything that meets national security requirements, for energy infrastructure, pipelines, refining capacity, power generation, domestic manufacturing—which includes everything, whether it's important or not—health care, telecommunications, transportation. What we're doing is we're gutting protections for everything, not those that are just needed.

I present a methodology which will allow a real clear definition, not just of what's in the bill now, but include a methodology that the Secretary of the Interior can include if the material is really needed to be mined.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. China is not trying to lock up the world's sand and gravel. We do have to worry about the supply of yttrium and gadolinium and these other things that are necessary for jet engines and magnets and hard drives in laptops and so forth.

Let me just address the point that has to do with this definition that my friend from Washington talks about, winners and losers. Yes, this bill has winners and losers. The winners would be the mining companies. The losers would be local communities, the environment, water quality, wildlife, and the American taxpayers.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I am prepared to close if the gentleman is prepared to close.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from California has 15 seconds remaining.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Again, I introduced this amendment that would narrow the bill's definition to not what is purported to be strategic but actually what is strategic, that if we're going to give benefits, they must be strategic, and my amendment provides for an actual way of measuring that.

I urge adoption of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. How much time do I have remaining, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield myself the balance of my time.

I think the gentleman from New Jersey did say this picks winners and losers—at least he didn't deny it—and then he tried to turn it around and say that we pick winners and losers. I will acknowledge that from this standpoint:

the winners will be those States that have huge, huge swaths of Federal land. The winners will be the communities in those States that have large swaths of Federal land that want to create jobs, because jobs are created because of the natural resources in those States. So from that sense, yes, we are picking winners and losers, and, frankly, I am proud of that.

But I have to say this, Mr. Chairman. In listening to my friend's argument on this, keep in mind what this bill does. This bill tries to provide certainty for those that would want to get into the mining business by saying that you have to have a decision made in 30 months. Now, the decision doesn't have to be affirmative, but there has to be a decision.

What this gentleman is saying, what the effect of this amendment is, as I hear his argument, is there is one more layer we have to go through before it is strategic, and that's the Secretary of the Interior. Does that not suggest that that might be a political problem, then, rather than a problem based on what is needed? No. The four broad categories is a much, much better way to do it.

I think the gentleman's amendment is misplaced. I urge its rejection, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. VEASEY

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 113-214.

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 5, after line 26, insert the following:

SEC. 4. PUBLICATION OF CRITICAL MINERALS.

The Secretary of the Interior shall publish in the Federal Register—

(1) by not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, a list of the minerals that are strategic and critical minerals for purposes of this Act; and

(2) every 5 years thereafter, an updated list of such minerals.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 347, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VEASEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise to offer this amendment because, Mr. Chairman, mineral exploration and mining have a deep history in our country. We have vast resources

in America that we have been able to use for our own security, innovation, and economic benefit. This is why we must continue to explore these resources in a smart, environmentally sensitive manner.

It is dangerous for America to depend on countries like China for rare-earth elements and rare metals. These elements are necessary for telecommunications, military technologies, health care technologies, as well as conventional and renewable energy technologies. But the underlying bill goes far beyond these specific minerals in defining what constitutes "strategic and critical."

While the National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act gives four characteristics for what should be a strategic and critical mineral, it leaves the exact minerals open to interpretation. The majority has stated that their purpose in leaving the definition so broad is to allow for flexibility over time. This bill would cover virtually all hard rock mining on Federal lands.

I think most Americans will agree that sand and gravel are important to our economy, but how many would be willing to go on Federal lands, places such as the Grand Canyon, in order to mine these two elements?

That is why I have proposed my amendment to H.R. 761. My amendment would give the Secretary of the Interior the authority to specifically list what are strategic and critical minerals and make this information available to the public. After a given number of years looking at the global and national landscape for mineral exploration, the Secretary would have the authority to change this list as factors dictate. This allows for flexibility in responding to global mineral markets while protecting our public resources.

Mr. Chairman, I know both Democrats and Republicans strongly support the development of rare-earth elements and other critical minerals necessary for our national security and national competitiveness, but we must refrain from allowing the mining industry to define what is critical solely in accordance with their economic needs. That is why I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on my amendment to define what minerals are of national public interest and to protect the prestige of our public lands.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Clearly, with the last amendment and this amendment, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are really disturbed about what strategic is. I guess I can understand that. I obviously disagree with that.

This is very similar to the last amendment, except it specifically gives the Secretary of the Interior that power to decide what is critical or not.

Now, I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, I don't think from a policy standpoint we should give that much power to anybody to say what is critical and not as far as minerals concerned that support our economy. Let me just give you a case in point of how we run into problems with this.

Less than 10 years ago, people were concerned about platinum group metals used in computers and electronics and the pending shortfall of copper. So because we hadn't defined these broad categories—see, if we had this bill in place 10 years ago, this category would have taken care of itself because the market would have suggested we need new minerals in order to support a certain sector of the economy. But no, when you pick winners and losers, then you have to go through the whole process and the hand-wringing and the high prices and all of those things that slow down the economy.

So, once again, in deference to my good friend that offered this amendment, in a bill that is trying to add certainty to the regulatory process, this adds another layer of uncertainty by giving it to the Secretary of the Interior. I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, I don't think that is good policy.

This goes along again with the last amendment. By voice vote, that was rejected. This should be rejected in a like manner. I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Washington, in this bill, who would decide what is a strategic and critical mineral?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I would be more than happy to tell you. And I made this. If you look on page five, under Definitions: Strategic and Critical Minerals. The term "strategic and critical minerals" means minerals that are necessary—and there's four categories—for national defense and national security requirements. I can't predict in 25 years which mineral will support our weapons, for example, but that is a category in which that would be a critical mineral.

B, for the Nation's energy infrastructure, including pipelines, refining capacity, electrical power generation and transmission, and renewable energy production. Now, I have no idea what, in the future, critical minerals we will need to support those activities, but I know before wind and solar took hold, nobody was worrying about those minerals. But this category, if you had it by category, you would not have to go through the hand-wringing to find out where that source is.

C, to support domestic manufacturing, agriculture, housing, telecommunications, health care, and transportation infrastructure.

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, again, I want to ask the gentleman: Who would decide what is strategic and a critical mineral? I mean, I listened to the gentleman in his explanation, and I never heard exactly who would decide in his explanation.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VEASEY. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Well, just let me finish then because there's only one more, and I do want to say that.

For the Nation's economic security and balance of trade. So once that category is defined and somebody wants to refine some element—I don't know, pick a name; there are all these new names; I can't pronounce them anyway—and they find out that there's a new industry that wants a certain element, if an entrepreneur wants to mine for that, they make the permit and it's decided by the Federal agency. Very simple. And if it fits this category, he gets the permit. That's the beauty of it.

Mr. VEASEY. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, the answer to that would be the Secretary of the Interior.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1500

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time.

I just want to say that we have somewhat exhausted this; but the difference between this gentleman's amendment and the broad categories I say is that he—he—or I should say the Secretary of the Interior—picks that. The Secretary picks it.

Under the underlying bill, yes, the Secretary picks it; but if it meets these broad categories, then, of course, he has to pick that mineral. That makes perfectly good sense because it responds to the marketplace.

Mr. Chairman, I urge rejection of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VEASEY).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 113-214.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Beginning at page 6, strike line 22 and all that follows through page 7, line 9, and insert the following:

(b) DETERMINATION UNDER NEPA.—The lead agency with responsibility for issuing a mineral exploration or mine permit shall determine any such action would constitute a major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment within the meaning of the National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 4331 et seq.).

Beginning at page 7, strike line 24 and all that follows through page 9, line 7.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 347, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Here we go again. Another week, another attempt by the House majority to gut critical environmental protections that we know save lives and communities. Right before we left for the August recess, a break I urged the Republican leadership to forego, the House passed a reckless offshore oil drilling bill that risks our shoreline communities along the Atlantic, Pacific, and gulf coasts. And for what? To continue our dependence on fossil fuels.

H.R. 761 is not unknown to Congress. In fact, we had passed a rule and were set to consider it only a few weeks ago before the House majority abruptly pulled it from the floor and rammed through a partisan farm bill instead—a bill that protected farm subsidies, crop insurance guarantees, and handouts for Big Agribusiness, including some Members of this very body, at the expense of the neediest among us, including more than 210,000 children.

Yet here we are today. Once again, the House majority is attempting to not only remove environmental safeguards provided under the National Environmental Policy Act, but to set arbitrary deadlines for its approval process.

I am pleased to once again offer this commonsense amendment that will preserve NEPA protections and ensure that a thorough safety review is conducted.

In 1969, Congress passed the National Environmental Policy Act, a bipartisan act with strong Republican support, including President Richard Nixon, who understood then that environmental impacts on large projects must be explored, understood, and eventually mitigated.

Under NEPA, any infrastructure project that could have a significant impact is now subject to an environmental impact statement, which outlines the purpose of the project, possible alternatives, the affected environment, and the consequences of completing the project. The findings are then considered prior to final project approval.

Projects with less environmental impact may be subjected to a less detailed environmental assessment instead. Some projects, like the construction of a foot trail, may be deemed to have no significant environmental impact and can receive a categorical exclusion.

Make no mistake, the bill before us today has no foot path. We are talking about major mining projects that could devastate entire communities. There are many aspects of mineral exploration policy for which statutory changes should be considered, such as closing Clean Air Act and Clean Water Act loopholes. Unfortunately, that's not what we're doing here.

As I've noted before, considering that all other major projects, even transit projects with clear environmental benefits, must still go through an environmental impact statement, it is absurd to turn around and exclude from such analysis activities or put an arbitrary time limit on it that has such potential to actually destroy ecosystems and regional economies.

My commonsense amendment, Mr. Chairman, would simply restore that process so that there can be peace and comfort of mind to affected communities, and I urge its adoption.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition to this amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, if you like the current 7- to 10-year timeframe to do mining permits in this country, then you will love this amendment; but this bill is all about making it possible to do mining in this country and use our natural resources in a reasonable, commonsense way.

Other countries, like Australia and Canada, have a 2-year time cycle from beginning to end to get your application and permit done so you can begin mining. In this country, it's 7 to 10 years. That's why we have declining activity of the well-paying jobs that mining produces, the resources that are available from mining so we don't have to rely on countries like China.

This amendment would eviscerate, this amendment would gut, what this bill is trying to do. It's unnecessary because NEPA already applies. NEPA remains in force. This just allows needless and endless bureaucratic delays by allowing NEPA to do an environmental impact statement at almost every step in the whole process.

It is important to have a certainty of when the process is over so you know whether or not you can invest in a long-term project like this. Seven to 10 years is beyond any of our economic cycles. It is not feasible from a business standpoint to wait that long in a commodity market like minerals and metals to make these investment decisions. You to have certainty, you have to have closure, you have to have a time certain that you're done.

So the 30-month timeframe is critical. We respect and uphold NEPA. It remains in effect, but we get rid of the ability to do it at every step in the process.

This amendment would be a backward step and back to the current status quo which makes it harder to have

mining projects in this country with the jobs that they create, with the benefit to our economy that these minerals allow for.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge a strong “no” on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I would inquire how much time is left on this side.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I certainly respect my friend and his point of view about the mining industry. I wish it were true that the other side of the aisle respects the NEPA process; but, frankly, we’ve had bill after bill and amendment after amendment in excess of 100 that actually attack everything from the Clean Water Act to the Clean Air Act that have resisted regulation even when it comes to public health and particulate matter, for example. They have assaulted the NEPA process every step of the way.

In this bill, there’s a huge carve-out for one industry—the mining industry. It is not true that the average is 7 to 10 years. It may be true that some have had that. But it is also true that a NEPA process protects communities. It answers questions. It answers the very uncertainty my friend talked about. But sometimes it answers that uncertainty in a way that the industry and its supporters don’t like.

I think our job here is not so much to protect wealthy advocates of a particular industry who may also positively influence the financing of campaigns. I think our first duty is to protect public health and safety, those communities that have found themselves devastated because proper environmental analysis, in fact, had not been done. We have seen that all across America from Appalachia to southern Illinois to in the West.

I, too, want to make sure we unlock strategic minerals and that the United States has them available when it needs it. But I don’t believe that the tradeoff has to be at the expense of every community that could potentially be the site of a mine.

Mr. Chairman, I actually strongly urge my colleagues to vote “yes” for this commonsense amendment to restore an environmental analysis process that, in fact, has worked.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to remind my colleague from Virginia that this administration has streamlined NEPA for several uses during its time in office for renewable energy projects, for highways, for the so-called “stimulus” that we had in 2007. So this administration at times, anyway, sees the need to balance the creation of jobs with protecting the environment, but not allowing environmental regulations to be used to endlessly delay projects.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment, I’m afraid, would endlessly delay the production of the projects that we need to produce critical and strategic minerals. For that reason I urge a “no” vote.

Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time I have left.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Colorado has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my colleague and friend from New Mexico, Representative PEARCE.

Mr. PEARCE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would make a comment to my friend from Virginia that we in the West are being protected from ourselves, we are being protected from jobs. The devastation is in our jobs.

I have one county—I have 18 counties—one county is 7,000 square miles. That is three times the size of Delaware. It is six times the size of Rhode Island. It has a population of 3,725 people. The jobs have gone away. There used to be 11 rare-earth mineral mines in the southern district of New Mexico. Today there are none. All of those jobs have gone to China.

This is just a commonsense bill that says we are going to go through the process. We have economies that are being devastated, but it’s not an environmental devastation. It is from the environmentalist who will sue to stop every single job in the West. We’ve lost our mining jobs; we’ve lost our timber jobs. These are areas that are not sitting out here making life unlivable and unhealthy; these are areas that are looking for jobs.

I would urge a “no” vote on the amendment with respect to my friend.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remainder of my time and say that if you think it’s a good situation for the United States to be lumped in with Papua, New Guinea, dead last among mining countries in this world, as shown by a recent study, in that it takes 7 to 10 years to get mining projects off the ground, then you would like this amendment. But if you don’t, if you think we can protect the environment at the same time as creating jobs and strike that balance, which this bill does, then you will vote “no” on this amendment and “yes” on H.R. 761.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 113-214.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 9, line 14, before “The lead agency” insert the following:

(1) IN GENERAL.—

Page 9, line 21, before the period insert “, the cost of cleanup in the event of any release occurring at such site, and the costs incurred by the United States to implement this subsection”.

Page 9, after line 21, insert the following:

(2) FORM.—Such financial assurance shall be in the form of a surety bond, letter of credit, or other instrument that would routinely be accepted in commerce.

(3) AMOUNT BASED ON TYPE OF OPERATION.—The amount of such financial assurance shall be based on the type of mining operation to be conducted.

(4) INSPECTIONS.—The lead agency shall conduct annual inspections and reviews of financial insurance required under this subsection.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 347, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me read the amendment. It’s very short:

The lead agency with responsibility for issuing a mineral exploration or mine permit may not issue such permit until the applicant for the permit has fully reimbursed the United States, each State, and each Native American tribe for all costs incurred by the United States and such State and such tribe respectively for issuance of the permit. Such reimbursement shall include costs of all Federal, State and tribal reviews and approvals required for the permit, contracting costs and salaries, including benefits for State and Federal employees and the conduct of reviews by State, a State that under authority delegated to the State under Federal law.

□ 1515

Mr. Chairman, the amendment that I offer today to H.R. 761 would reimburse the costs of permitting in order that the National Environmental Policy Act requirements be met. Those who complain about the National Environmental Policy Act permitting—and it has been said here repeatedly on the floor, and when I was managing the rule earlier today, it was said—often cite timing as a concern. With budget cuts, furloughs, and other competing work, it is not possible to meet all the demands. The reimbursement of any and all costs will help to resolve this issue and provide for meaningful public participation in the decisionmaking process for the use of Federal lands.

Mr. Chairman, I would ultimately ask that my amendment be made in order.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the intention behind this amendment, and I thank the gentleman for offering it. I do want to reassure him, though, that the bill and current law already satisfy what he is after, so I would urge a “no” vote on this amendment.

Let me read specifically from the language of the bill. This is on page 9. I’m going to read a paragraph, and, hopefully, this will alleviate your concerns:

(g) Financial Assurance. The lead agency will determine the amount of financial assurance for reclamation of a mineral exploration or mining site, which must cover the estimated cost if the lead agency were to contract with a third party to reclaim the operations according to the reclamation plan, including construction and maintenance costs for any treatment facilities necessary to meet Federal, State or tribal environmental standards.

So, in case the company goes bankrupt—in the worst case scenario—it has to post a bond, and I believe it’s equal to 140 percent of what the reclamation cost would be.

We already have comprehensive regulations in addition to the bill language from the Bureau of Land Management and the U.S. Forest Service. These regulations have been revised during both the Clinton and Bush administrations so that, today, both BLM and Forest Service regulations require that exploration and mining activities have the resources necessary to ensure reclamation after it’s over even if the company goes bankrupt.

I appreciate the intention behind this amendment, but I believe it is completely unnecessary. So, for that reason, Mr. Chairman, I would urge a “no” vote on the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I need to make a correction.

I had two amendments in the Rules Committee last night. The one that I just read into the RECORD and that my friend and colleague just responded to was the one that was not made in order, but I will be very brief because the one that was made in order, amendment No. 4, which we are addressing, requires financial assurance in the form of a surety bond, a letter of credit, or other instrument that would routinely be accepted in commerce.

In the interest of time, I would only offer, Mr. Chairman, that my full statement on amendment No. 4 be placed in the RECORD. I am sure my colleague has time to respond to amendment No. 4. If he does not, I would be prepared to yield to him whatever time I have in order for him to respond.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment that I offer today to H.R. 761, would reimburse the cost of permitting and order that the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requirements be met. Those who complain about NEPA permitting, often cite timing as a concern. With budget cuts, furloughs, and other competing work, it is not possible to meet all demands.

Reimbursement of any and all costs will help to resolve this issue, and provide for meaningful public participation in the decision-making process for the use of Federal lands.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I urge the Committee to make my amendment in order.

At the end of title I (page 12, after line 2) add the following:

SEC. 01. ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR ISSUANCE OF MINERAL EXPLORATION OR MINE PERMIT.

(a) RECOVERY OF COSTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The lead agency with responsibility for issuing a mineral exploration or mine permit may not issue such permit until the applicant for the permit has fully reimbursed the United States, each State, and each Indian tribe for all costs incurred by the United States, such State, and such tribe, respectively, for issuance of the permit.

(2) COSTS INCLUDED.—Such reimbursement shall include—

(A) costs of all Federal, State, and tribal reviews and approvals required for the permit; and

(B) contracting costs and salaries (including benefits) for State and Federal employees.

(b) CONDUCT OF REVIEWS BY STATES.—A State that, under authority delegated to the State under Federal law, performs any function required for the issuance of a mineral exploration or mine permit shall perform such function in accordance with all requirements that would apply under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) to performance of such function by a Federal agency.

(c) EXTENSION OF TIME LIMITS.—Any period of time established by Federal law for the issuance of a mineral exploration or mine permit shall be extended by the period of any delay in such issuance that is attributable to a failure of the permit applicant to timely complete any action required for such issuance, including any failure to timely submit any request or payment.

Mr. LAMBORN. May I inquire of the Chair how much time I have remaining.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Colorado has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, let me just summarize by saying that we already have it in current law and that it’s already addressed in this bill that there must be adequate financial assurances given, including the posting of bonds to ensure that the reclamation can take place by contract for third parties if the company goes bankrupt or, for whatever reason, can’t follow through. All of our western public land States also have comprehensive regulatory and bonding programs covering hard rock mining. That’s in addition to the Federal laws and regulations. In many of these States, the Federal and State agencies work together to jointly manage the reclamation and bonding projects.

As of June of 2013, BLM, in conjunction with its State partners, currently holds more than \$2.2 billion in financial assurances to reclaim potential mining sites around the U.S. So you can see this is an active and well-funded program that is in place. Under regulation, these holdings are reviewed and adjusted annually to make sure that costs won’t spiral out of control if we

have inflation or unforeseen contingencies. In some instances, mining companies are required to establish trust funds and to build them over the course of the mine life to ensure adequate funding for any long-term treatment facilities that might be necessary to meet Federal, State, or tribal environmental standards.

So I believe, Mr. Chairman, that there are already in place appropriate and adequate protections and regulations and that the bill respects that also. I respect the gentleman for his intentions on this amendment, but I believe that it is unnecessary, and for that reason, I would urge a “no” vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I would just say to my colleague that there are deficiencies and inadequacies of funding in the measures that you cited, and they do not cover the cost of cleanup and accidents. That’s why we are addressing it.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask and urge my colleagues to vote “aye” on this measure.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. PEARCE

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 113-214.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following:

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. SECRETARIAL ORDER NOT AFFECTED.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed as to affect any aspect of Secretarial Order 3324, issued by the Secretary of the Interior on December 3, 2012, with respect to potash and oil and gas operators.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 347, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment today to H.R. 761, the National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act.

My amendment is very simple. It only serves to clarify the scope of the bill by stating that it does not impact the rules put in place by Secretarial Order No. 3324, issued by the Secretary of the Interior late last year. That order sets in place buffer zones between potash mines and oil and gas drilling, among other requirements. The Permian Basin’s potash reserves are some

of the purist in the world, and our oil and gas drilling plays a key role in the current energy boom that the country is experiencing.

There is a very long history between potash and drilling operators in the region, and the secretarial order helped to clarify some of those issues. I've spent the better part of my career in Congress working to facilitate an agreement between these two industries to ensure both are able to thrive simultaneously. While some have criticisms of the secretarial order, it is an important step in the process of assuring the safe extraction of mineral resources.

My amendment simply clarifies that the text of the bill cannot be used by the Bureau of Land Management to show favoritism for either potash or oil and gas leases within the area laid out in the secretarial order. It does not affect the underlying bill, and it does not cost the American taxpayers a single dime. It brings economic stability to the Permian Basin and ensures that these two mineral resources can be safely and properly developed side by side.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time that is allotted to the opposition to this amendment, although I do not intend to oppose it.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak on this amendment because it makes a point very well that I was making earlier today.

We have criticized this bill because, while it is being sold as necessary for critical and strategic minerals, the definition is so broad that it would cover virtually all mining on public lands. Mr. PEARCE shares our concern. The gentleman is worried that, if H.R. 761 is enacted, the definition is broad enough that it would cover even potash.

Now, potash is important as fertilizer for crops and for other purposes, but let's be clear—it is not used very much in high-tech manufacturing; it is not used in manufacturing items that are important for our national defense; and it is not scarce. It is one of a long list of minerals that produces money for miners, but it should not be covered under this very broad definition in the underlying bill.

I agree with Mr. PEARCE that potash could be covered under this legislation, and we agree that elevating mining for potash on public lands under this bill could impact other uses of those lands, including the development of oil and gas, so I am happy to support this amendment to clarify this overly broad definition.

I would like to note that we had an amendment a few moments ago, offered by our colleague Mr. LOWENTHAL, which would fix the definition in this bill by limiting the bill to truly stra-

tegic and critical minerals determined to be, as the gentleman Mr. LOWENTHAL described, a really thorough and, let's say, academic definition of those minerals. It would address not only Mr. PEARCE's concerns, but it would solve one of the overall problems of this bill.

I am happy to support the amendment, and I thank the gentleman for making our case for us.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to differ with the gentleman from New Jersey, my friend.

He said that potash is not very high-tech. When you use a scoop shovel to follow the cows around and use the by-product from the cattle to fertilize with, potash is extremely high-tech.

So, with that one exception, I yield 30 seconds to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, nothing in this bill impacts the important multiple use mission of our Nation's public lands. One of the great stories of America is that our Nation recognizes the importance of balancing our land use for many different needs, including mineral and oil and gas development, renewable energy projects, grazing, timber harvests, hunting, fishing, recreation, and other important activities that bring economic vitality to our public lands.

This legislation doesn't change that. It simply addresses the long bureaucratic and burdensome permitting timelines required for mineral exploration and mine development by building on executive orders requiring coordination by regulatory agencies to process permits for infrastructure projects in a timely manner and without compromising environmental safeguards.

Mr. HOLT. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chairman, I have no other comments, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1530

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise. The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAMALFA) having assumed the chair, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 761) to require the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to more efficiently develop domestic sources of the minerals and mineral materials of strategic and critical importance to United States economic and national security and manufacturing competitiveness, had come to no resolution thereon.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A further message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Brian Pate, one of his secretaries.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1631

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio) at 4 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.

NATIONAL STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MINERALS PRODUCTION ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 347 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 761.

Will the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) kindly take the chair.

□ 1631

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 761) to require the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to more efficiently develop domestic sources of the minerals and mineral materials of strategic and critical importance to United States economic and national security and manufacturing competitiveness.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 113-214 offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) had been disposed of.

Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 113-214 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. LOWENTHAL of California.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. VEASEY of Texas.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. LOWENTHAL

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded

vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 187, noes 241, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 466]

AYES—187

Andrews	Green, Al	Negrete McLeod
Barber	Green, Gene	Nolan
Bass	Grijalva	O'Rourke
Beatty	Gutiérrez	Pallone
Becerra	Hahn	Pascarell
Bera (CA)	Hanabusa	Pastor (AZ)
Bishop (NY)	Hastings (FL)	Payne
Blumenauer	Heck (WA)	Pelosi
Bonamici	Higgins	Perlmutter
Brady (PA)	Himes	Peters (CA)
Braley (IA)	Hinojosa	Peters (MI)
Brown (FL)	Holt	Pingree (ME)
Brownley (CA)	Honda	Pocan
Bustos	Horsford	Price (NC)
Butterfield	Hoyer	Quigley
Capps	Huffman	Rahall
Capuano	Israel	Rangel
Cárdenas	Jackson Lee	Richmond
Carney	Jeffries	Roybal-Allard
Carson (IN)	Johnson (GA)	Ruiz
Cartwright	Johnson, E. B.	Ruppersberger
Castor (FL)	Kaptur	Ryan (OH)
Castro (TX)	Keating	Sánchez, Linda
Chu	Kelly (IL)	T.
Cicilline	Kennedy	Sanchez, Loretta
Clarke	Kildee	Sarbanes
Clay	Kilmer	Schakowsky
Cleaver	Kind	Schiff
Clyburn	Kirkpatrick	Schneider
Connolly	Kuster	Schrader
Conyers	Langevin	Schwartz
Cooper	Larsen (WA)	Scott (VA)
Costa	Larson (CT)	Scott, David
Courtney	Lee (CA)	Serrano
Crowley	Levin	Sewell (AL)
Cummings	Lewis	Shea-Porter
Davis (CA)	Lipinski	Sherman
Davis, Danny	Loeb sack	Sinema
DeFazio	Lofgren	Sires
DeGette	Lowenthal	Slaughter
Delaney	Lowe y	Smith (WA)
DeLauro	Lujan Grisham	Speier
DelBene	(NM)	Swalwell (CA)
Deutch	Luján, Ben Ray	Takano
Dingell	(NM)	Thompson (CA)
Doggett	Lynch	Thompson (MS)
Doyle	Maloney,	Tierney
Duckworth	Carolyn	Tonko
Edwards	Maloney, Sean	Tsongas
Ellison	Matsui	Van Hollen
Engel	McCollum	Vargas
Enyart	McDermott	Veasey
Eshoo	McGovern	Vela
Esty	McNerney	Velázquez
Farr	Meeks	Visclosky
Fattah	Meng	Walz
Foster	Michaud	Wasserman
Frankel (FL)	Miller, George	Schultz
Fudge	Moore	Waters
Gabbard	Moran	Watt
Gallego	Murphy (FL)	Waxman
Garamendi	Nadler	Welch
Garcia	Napolitano	Wilson (FL)
Grayson	Neal	Yarmuth

NOES—241

Aderholt	Barton	Brady (TX)
Alexander	Benishke	Bridenstine
Amash	Bentivolio	Brooks (AL)
Amodei	Bilirakis	Brooks (IN)
Bachmann	Bishop (GA)	Brown (GA)
Bachus	Bishop (UT)	Buchanan
Barletta	Black	Bucshon
Barr	Blackburn	Burgess
Barrow (GA)	Boustany	Calvert

Camp	Huizenga (MI)	Radel
Campbell	Hultgren	Reed
Cantor	Hunter	Reichert
Capito	Hurt	Renacci
Carter	Issa	Ribble
Cassidy	Jenkins	Rice (SC)
Chabot	Johnson (OH)	Rigell
Chaffetz	Johnson, Sam	Roby
Coble	Jones	Roe (TN)
Coffman	Jordan	Rogers (AL)
Cohen	Joyce	Rogers (KY)
Cole	Kelly (PA)	Rogers (MI)
Collins (GA)	King (IA)	Rohrabacher
Collins (NY)	King (NY)	Rokita
Conaway	Kingston	Rooney
Cook	Kinzing (IL)	Ros-Lehtinen
Cotton	Kline	Roskam
Cramer	Labrador	Ross
Crawford	LaMalfa	Rothfus
Crenshaw	Lamborn	Royce
Cuellar	Lance	Runyan
Culberson	Lankford	Ryan (WI)
Daines	Latham	Salmon
Davis, Rodney	Latta	Sanford
Denham	LoBiondo	Scalise
Dent	Long	Schock
DeSantis	Lucas	Schweikert
DesJarlais	Luetkemeyer	Scott, Austin
Diaz-Balart	Lummis	Sensenbrenner
Duffy	Maffei	Sessions
Duncan (SC)	Marchant	Shimkus
Duncan (TN)	Marino	Shuster
Ellmers	Massie	Simpson
Farenthold	Matheson	Smith (MO)
Fincher	McCarthy (CA)	Smith (NE)
Fitzpatrick	McCaul	Smith (NJ)
Fleischmann	McClintock	Smith (TX)
Fleming	McHenry	Southerland
Florio	McIntyre	Stewart
Forbes	McKeon	Stivers
Fortenberry	McKinley	Stockman
Fox	McMorris	Stutzman
Franks (AZ)	Rodgers	Terry
Frelinghuysen	Meadows	Thompson (PA)
Gardner	Meehan	Thornberry
Garrett	Messer	Tiberi
Gerlach	Mica	Tipton
Gibbs	Miller (FL)	Titus
Gibson	Miller (MI)	Turner
Gingrey (GA)	Miller, Gary	Upton
Gohmert	Mullin	Valadao
Goodlatte	Mulvaney	Wagner
Gosar	Murphy (PA)	Walberg
Gowdy	Neugebauer	Walorski
Granger	Noem	Weber (TX)
Graves (GA)	Nugent	Webster (FL)
Graves (MO)	Nunes	Wenstrup
Griffin (AR)	Nunnelee	Westmoreland
Griffith (VA)	Olson	Whitfield
Grimm	Owens	Williams
Guthrie	Palazzo	Wilson (SC)
Hall	Paulsen	Wittman
Hanna	Pearce	Wolf
Harper	Perry	Womack
Harris	Peterson	Woodall
Hartzler	Petri	Yoder
Hastings (WA)	Pittenger	Yoho
Heck (NV)	Pitts	Young (AK)
Hensarling	Poe (TX)	Young (FL)
Holding	Pompeo	Young (IN)
Hudson	Posey	
Huelskamp	Price (GA)	

NOT VOTING—4

□ 1659

Messrs. NEUGEBAUER, POE of Texas, ROKITA, GRIFFIN of Arkansas, BILIRAKIS, BARR, Mrs. BACHMANN, and Mr. MCINTYRE changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. TIERNEY, GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. VEASEY

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. HOLDING). The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment

offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VEASEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 189, noes 237, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 467]

AYES—189

Andrews	Grayson	Negrete McLeod
Barber	Green, Al	Nolan
Bass	Green, Gene	O'Rourke
Beatty	Grijalva	Owens
Becerra	Gutiérrez	Pallone
Bera (CA)	Hahn	Pascarell
Bishop (NY)	Hanabusa	Pastor (AZ)
Blumenauer	Hastings (FL)	Payne
Bonamici	Heck (WA)	Pelosi
Brady (PA)	Higgins	Peters (CA)
Braley (IA)	Himes	Peters (MI)
Brown (FL)	Hinojosa	Peterson
Brownley (CA)	Holt	Pingree (ME)
Bustos	Honda	Pocan
Butterfield	Horsford	Price (NC)
Capps	Hoyer	Quigley
Capuano	Huffman	Rahall
Cárdenas	Israel	Rangel
Carney	Jackson Lee	Richmond
Carson (IN)	Jeffries	Roybal-Allard
Cartwright	Johnson, E. B.	Ruiz
Castor (FL)	Kaptur	Ruppersberger
Castro (TX)	Keating	Ryan (OH)
Chu	Kelly (IL)	Sánchez, Linda
Cicilline	Kennedy	T.
Clarke	Kildee	Sanchez, Loretta
Clay	Kilmer	Sarbanes
Cleaver	Kind	Schakowsky
Clyburn	Kirkpatrick	Schiff
Cohen	Kuster	Schneider
Connolly	Langevin	Schrader
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	Schwartz
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Scott (VA)
Costa	Lee (CA)	Scott, David
Courtney	Levin	Serrano
Crowley	Lewis	Sewell (AL)
Cuellar	Lipinski	Shea-Porter
Cummings	Loeb sack	Sherman
Davis (CA)	Lofgren	Sinema
Davis, Danny	Lowenthal	Sires
DeFazio	Lowe y	Slaughter
DeGette	Lujan Grisham	Smith (WA)
Delaney	(NM)	Speier
DeLauro	Luján, Ben Ray	Swalwell (CA)
DelBene	(NM)	Takano
Deutch	Lynch	Thompson (CA)
Dingell	Maloney,	Thompson (MS)
Doggett	Carolyn	Tierney
Doyle	Maloney, Sean	Tonko
Duckworth	Matsui	Tsongas
Edwards	McCollum	Van Hollen
Ellison	McDermott	Vargas
Engel	McGovern	Veasey
Enyart	McIntyre	Velázquez
Eshoo	McNerney	Visclosky
Esty	Meeks	Walz
Farr	Meng	Wasserman
Fattah	Michaud	Schultz
Foster	Miller, George	Watt
Frankel (FL)	Moore	Waxman
Fudge	Moran	Welch
Gabbard	Murphy (FL)	Wilson (FL)
Gallego	Nadler	Yarmuth
Garamendi	Napolitano	
Gibson	Neal	

NOES—237

Aderholt	Barr	Bishop (UT)
Alexander	Barrow (GA)	Black
Amash	Barton	Blackburn
Amodei	Benishke	Boustany
Bachmann	Bentivolio	Brady (TX)
Bachus	Bilirakis	Bridenstine
Barletta	Bishop (GA)	Brooks (AL)

Brooks (IN) Holding
Broun (GA) Hudson
Buchanan Huelskamp
Bucshon Huizenga (MI)
Burgess Hultgren
Calvert Hunter
Camp Hurt
Campbell Issa
Cantor Jenkins
Capito Johnson (OH)
Carter Johnson, Sam
Cassidy Jones
Chabot Jordan
Chaffetz Joyce
Coble Kelly (PA)
Coffman King (IA)
Cole King (NY)
Collins (GA) Kingston
Collins (NY) Kinzinger (IL)
Conaway Kline
Cook Labrador
Cotton LaMalfa
Cramer Lance
Crawford Lankford
Crenshaw Latham
Culberson Latta
Daines LoBiondo
Davis, Rodney Long
Denham Lucas
Dent Luetkemeyer
DeSantis Lummis
DesJarlais Maffei
Diaz-Balart Marchant
Duffy Marino
Duncan (SC) Massie
Duncan (TN) Matheson
Ellmers McCarthy (CA)
Farenthold McCaul
Fincher McClintock
Fitzpatrick McHenry
Fleischmann McKeon
Fleming McKinley
Flores McMorris
Forbes Rodgers
Fortenberry Meadows
Foxy Meehan
Franks (AZ) Messer
Frelinghuysen Mica
Garcia Miller (FL)
Gardner Miller (MI)
Garrett Miller, Gary
Gerlach Mullin
Gibbs Mulvaney
Gingrey (GA) Murphy (PA)
Gohmert Neugebauer
Goodlatte Noem
Gosar Nugent
Gowdy Nunes
Granger Nunnelee
Graves (GA) Olson
Graves (MO) Palazzo
Griffin (AR) Paulsen
Griffith (VA) Pearce
Grimm Perlmutter
Guthrie Perry
Hall Petri
Hanna Pittenger
Harper Pitts
Harris Poe (TX)
Hartzler Pompeo
Hastings (WA) Posey
Heck (NV) Price (GA)
Hensarling Radel

NOT VOTING—6

Herrera Beutler Lamborn Polis
Johnson (GA) McCarthy (NY) Rush

□ 1706

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE
The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 186, noes 240, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 468]

AYES—186

Andrews Green, Al Neal
Barber Green, Gene Negrete McLeod
Bass Grijalva Nolan
Beatty Gutierrez O'Rourke
Becerra Hahn Pallone
Bera (CA) Hanabusa Pascrell
Bishop (NY) Hastings (FL) Pastor (AZ)
Blumenauer Heck (WA) Payne
Bonamici Higgins Pelosi
Brady (PA) Himes Perlmutter
Braley (IA) Hinojosa Peters (CA)
Brown (FL) Holt Peters (MI)
Brownley (CA) Honda Pocan
Bustos Horsford Price (NC)
Butterfield Hoyer Quigley
Capps Huffman Rahall
Capuano Israel Rangel
Cárdenas Jackson Lee Richmond
Carney Jeffries Roybal-Allard
Carson (IN) Johnson (GA) Ruiz
Cartwright Johnson, E. B. Ruppersberger
Castor (FL) Kaptur Ryan (OH)
Castro (TX) Keating Sanchez, Linda
Chu Kelly (IL) T.
Cicilline Kennedy Sanchez, Loretta
Clarke Kildee Sarbanes
Clay Kilmer Schakowsky
Cleaver Kind Schiff
Clyburn Kirkpatrick Schneider
Cohen Kuster Schrader
Connolly Langevin Schwartz
Conyers Larsen (WA) Scott (VA)
Cooper Larson (CT) Scott, David
Costa Lee (CA) Serrano
Courtney Levin Sewell (AL)
Crowley Lewis Shea-Porter
Cummings Lipinski Sherman
Davis (CA) Loebsack Sires
Davis, Danny Lofgren Slaughter
DeFazio Lowenthal Smith (WA)
DeGette Lowey Speier
Delaney Lujan Grisham Swalwell (CA)
DeLauro (NM) Takano
DelBene Luján, Ben Ray Thompson (CA)
Deutch (NM) Thompson (MS)
Dingell Lynch Tierney
Doggett Maloney, Carolyn Titus
Doyle Carolyn Tonko
Duckworth Maloney, Sean Tsongas
Edwards Matsui Van Hollen
Ellison McCollum Vargas
Engel McDermott Veasey
Enyart McGovern Velázquez
Eshoo McIntyre Visclosky
Esty McNeerney Walz
Farr Meeks Wasserman
Fattah Meng Schultz
Foster Michaud Waters
Frankel (FL) Miller, George Watt
Fudge Moore Waxman
Gabbard Moran Welch
Garamendi Murphy (FL) Wilson (FL)
Garcia Nadler Yarmuth
Grayson Napolitano

NOES—240

Aderholt Cole
Alexander Collins (GA)
Amash Collins (NY)
Amodei Conaway
Bachmann Cook
Barletta Cotton
Barr Cramer
Barrow (GA) Crawford
Barton Crenshaw
Benishek Cuellar
Bentivolio Cantor
Billirakis Culberson
Bishop (GA) Daines
Bishop (UT) Davis, Rodney
Black Denham
Blackburn Dent
Boustany DeSantis
Brady (TX) Chaffetz
Coffman Diaz-Balart

Duffy Lamborn Rogers (MI)
Duncan (SC) Lance Rohrabacher
Duncan (TN) Lankford Rokita
Ellmers Latham Rooney
Farenthold Latta Ros-Lehtinen
Fincher LoBiondo Roskam
Fitzpatrick Long Ross
Fleischmann Lucas Rothfus
Fleming Luetkemeyer Royce
Flores Lummis Runyan
Forbes Maffei Ryan (WI)
Fortenberry Marchant Salmon
Foxy Marino Sanford
Franks (AZ) Massie Scalise
Frelinghuysen Matheson Schock
Gallego McCarthy (CA) Schweikert
Gardner McCaul Scott, Austin
Garrett McClintock Sensenbrenner
Gerlach McHenry Sessions
Gibbs McKeon Shimkus
Gibson McKinley Shuster
Gingrey (GA) McMorris Simpson
Gohmert Rodgers Sinema
Goodlatte Meadows Smith (MO)
Gosar Meehan Smith (NE)
Gowdy Messer Smith (NJ)
Granger Mica Smith (TX)
Graves (GA) Miller (FL) Southernland
Graves (MO) Miller (MI) Stewart
Griffin (AR) Miller, Gary Stivers
Griffith (VA) Mullin Stockman
Grimm Mulvaney Stutzman
Guthrie Murphy (PA) Terry
Hall Neugebauer Thompson (PA)
Hanna Noem Thornberry
Harper Harper Nugent Tiberi
Harris Nunes Tipton
Hartzler Nunnelee Turner
Hastings (WA) Olson Upton
Heck (NV) Owens Valadao
Hensarling Palazzio Vela
Holding Paulsen Wagner
Hudson Pearce Walberg
Huelskamp Perry Walden
Huizenga (MI) Peterson Walorski
Hultgren Petri Weber (TX)
Hunter Pittenger Webster (FL)
Hurt Pitts Wenstrup
Issa Poe (TX) Westmoreland
Jenkins Pompeo Posey
Johnson (OH) Price (GA) Whitfield
Johnson, Sam Jones Radcliff
Jones Wilson (SC)
Jordan Reed Wittman
Joyce Reichert Wolf
Kelly (PA) Renacci Womack
King (IA) Ribble Woodall
King (NY) Rice (SC) Yoder
Kingston Rigell Yoho
Kinzinger (IL) Roby Young (AK)
Kline Roe (TN) Young (FL)
Labrador Rogers (AL) Young (IN)
LaMalfa Rogers (KY)

NOT VOTING—6

Bachus McCarthy (NY) Polis
Herrera Beutler Pingree (ME) Rush

□ 1712

Ms. ESHOO changed her vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 191, noes 235, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 469]

AYES—191

Andrews	Garcia	Nolan
Barber	Gibson	O'Rourke
Barrow (GA)	Grayson	Pallone
Bass	Green, Al	Pascarell
Beatty	Green, Gene	Pastor (AZ)
Becerra	Grijalva	Payne
Bera (CA)	Gutiérrez	Pelosi
Bishop (GA)	Hanabusa	Peters (CA)
Bishop (NY)	Hastings (FL)	Peters (MI)
Blumenauer	Heck (WA)	Peterson
Bonamici	Higgins	Pingree (ME)
Brady (PA)	Himes	Pocan
Braley (IA)	Hinojosa	Price (NC)
Brown (FL)	Holt	Quigley
Brownley (CA)	Honda	Rahall
Bustos	Horsford	Rangel
Butterfield	Hoyer	Richmond
Capps	Huffman	Roybal-Allard
Capuano	Israel	Ruiz
Cárdenas	Jackson Lee	Ruppersberger
Carney	Jeffries	Ryan (OH)
Carson (IN)	Johnson (GA)	Sánchez, Linda
Cartwright	Johnson, E. B.	T.
Castor (FL)	Kaptur	Sanchez, Loretta
Castro (TX)	Keating	Sarbanes
Chu	Kelly (IL)	Schakowsky
Cicilline	Kennedy	Schiff
Clarke	Kildee	Schneider
Clay	Kilmer	Schrader
Cleaver	Kind	Schwartz
Clyburn	Kirkpatrick	Scott (VA)
Cohen	Kuster	Scott, David
Connolly	Langevin	Serrano
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	Sewell (AL)
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Shea-Porter
Costa	Lee (CA)	Sherman
Courtney	Levin	Sinema
Crowley	Lewis	Sires
Cuellar	Lipinski	Slaughter
Cummings	Loeb sack	Smith (WA)
Davis (CA)	Lofgren	Speier
Davis, Danny	Lowenthal	Swalwell (CA)
DeFazio	Lowe y	Takano
DeGette	Lujan Grisham	Thompson (CA)
Delaney	(NM)	Thompson (MS)
DeLauro	Luján, Ben Ray	Tierney
DelBene	(NM)	Titus
Deutch	Lynch	Tonko
Dingell	Maloney,	Tsongas
Doggett	Carolyn	Van Hollen
Doyle	Maloney, Sean	Vargas
Duckworth	Matsui	Veasey
Edwards	McCollum	Vela
Ellison	McDermott	Velázquez
Engel	McGovern	Visclosky
Enyart	McNerney	Walz
Eshoo	Meeks	Wasserman
Esty	Michaud	Schultz
Farr	Miller, George	Waters
Fattah	Moore	Watt
Foster	Moran	Waxman
Frankel (FL)	Murphy (FL)	Welch
Fudge	Nadler	Wilson (FL)
Gabbard	Napolitano	Yarmuth
Galleo	Neal	
Garamendi	Negrete McLeod	

NOES—235

Aderholt	Calvert	Dent
Alexander	Camp	DeSantis
Amash	Campbell	DesJarlais
Amodei	Cantor	Diaz-Balart
Bachmann	Capito	Duffy
Bachus	Carter	Duncan (SC)
Barletta	Cassidy	Duncan (TN)
Barr	Chabot	Ellmers
Barton	Chaffetz	Farenthold
Benishek	Coble	Fincher
Bentivolio	Coffman	Fitzpatrick
Bilirakis	Cole	Fleischmann
Bishop (UT)	Collins (GA)	Fleming
Black	Collins (NY)	Flores
Blackburn	Conaway	Forbes
Boustany	Cook	Fortenberry
Brady (TX)	Cotton	Fox
Bridenstine	Cramer	Franks (AZ)
Brooks (AL)	Crawford	Frelinghuysen
Brooks (IN)	Crenshaw	Gardner
Broun (GA)	Culberson	Garrett
Buchanan	Daines	Gerlach
Bucshon	Davis, Rodney	Gibbs
Burgess	Denham	Gingrey (GA)

Gohmert	Matheson	Roskam
Goodlatte	McCarthy (CA)	Ross
Gosar	McCaul	Rothfus
Gowdy	McClintock	Royce
Granger	McHenry	Runyan
Graves (GA)	McIntyre	Ryan (WI)
Graves (MO)	McKeon	Salmon
Griffin (AR)	McKinley	Sanford
Griffith (VA)	McMorris	Scalise
Grimm	Rodgers	Schock
Guthrie	Meadows	Schweikert
Hall	Meehan	Scott, Austin
Hanna	Messer	Sensenbrenner
Harper	Mica	Sessions
Harris	Miller (FL)	Shimkus
Hartzler	Miller (MI)	Shuster
Hastings (WA)	Miller, Gary	Simpson
Heck (NV)	Mullin	Smith (MO)
Hensarling	Mulvaney	Smith (NE)
Holding	Murphy (PA)	Smith (NJ)
Hudson	Neugebauer	Smith (TX)
Huelskamp	Noem	Southerland
Huizenga (MI)	Nugent	Stewart
Hultgren	Nunes	Stivers
Hunter	Nunnelee	Stockman
Hurt	Olson	Stutzman
Issa	Owens	Terry
Jenkins	Palazzo	Thompson (PA)
Johnson (OH)	Paulsen	Thornberry
Johnson, Sam	Pearce	Tiberi
Jones	Perlmutter	Tipton
Jordan	Perry	Turner
Joyce	Petri	Upton
Kelly (PA)	Pittenger	Valadao
King (IA)	Pitts	Wagner
King (NY)	Poe (TX)	Walberg
Kingston	Pompeo	Walden
Kinzinger (IL)	Posey	Walorski
Kline	Price (GA)	Weber (TX)
Labrador	Radel	Webster (FL)
LaMalfa	Reed	Wenstrup
Lamborn	Reichert	Westmoreland
Lance	Renacci	Whitfield
Lankford	Ribble	Williams
Latham	Rice (SC)	Wilson (SC)
Latta	Rigell	Wittman
LoBiondo	Roby	Wolf
Long	Roe (TN)	Womack
Lucas	Rogers (AL)	Woodall
Luetkemeyer	Rogers (KY)	Yoder
Lummis	Rogers (MI)	Yoho
Maffei	Rohrabacher	Young (AK)
Marchant	Rokita	Young (FL)
Marino	Rooney	Young (IN)
Masie	Ros-Lehtinen	

NOT VOTING—6

Hahn	McCarthy (NY)	Polis
Herrera Beutler	Meng	Rush

□ 1717

Mr. COSTA changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia) having assumed the chair, Mr. HOLDING, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 761) to require the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to more efficiently develop domestic sources of the minerals and mineral materials of strategic and critical importance to United States economic and national security and manufacturing competitiveness, and, pursuant to House Resolution 347, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. CICILLINE. I am opposed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Cicilline moves to recommit the bill H.R. 761 to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of title I (page 12, after line 2), add the following new sections:

SEC. 105. PROHIBITIONS REGARDING CHINA AND IRAN.

(a) PROHIBITION ON EXPORT.—Each Federal mineral exploration or mine permit issued pursuant to this Act shall include provisions that prohibit export to China or Iran of strategic and critical minerals produced under the permit.

(b) PROHIBITION ON ISSUANCE OF PERMITS.—No Federal mineral exploration or mine permit may be issued pursuant to this Act to any company in which China or Iran has an ownership interest.

(c) PRESIDENTIAL WAIVER OF PROHIBITIONS WITH RESPECT TO CHINA.—The President may waive the prohibitions under subsections (a) and (b) with respect to China upon certification that the Government of China has removed its export restraints on strategic and critical minerals.

SEC. 106. PROHIBITION ON ISSUANCE OF PERMITS TO PERSONS, CORPORATIONS, AND SUBSIDIARIES CONVICTED OF VIOLATING SANCTIONS LAWS.

No Federal mineral exploration or mine permit shall be issued pursuant to this Act to a person, corporation, partnership, trust, or other form of business organization that has been convicted of violating the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note), the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8501 et seq.), the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8701 et seq.), or the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.).

Mr. AMODEI (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that we dispense with the reading of the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nevada?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Rhode Island is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill which

will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

Much of the debate today has properly focused on the importance of rare-earth elements to our national security and our economic competitiveness.

Globally, the demand for mineral materials continues to grow. These resources are critical for a wide range of products that help ensure the long-term viability of our manufacturing sector, public health, and our defense capabilities.

New technologies and emerging American industries rely on rare minerals. For example, a diverse set of less abundant heavy rare-earth elements are essential to the production of cell phone and laptop screens. Hybrid engines and advanced vehicle technologies similarly rely on these rare minerals. In addition, patients and health care professionals regularly use medical devices and equipment that require rare-earth elements during production.

Finally, our defense capabilities for manufacturers of jet fighter engines to satellite and antimissile systems rely on a consistent supply of rare-earth minerals.

This is an important subject for many business leaders and manufacturers in my home State of Rhode Island and all across our country. In order to plan for the future and to hire additional workers, businesses need to be certain that the supply chain for essential minerals remains consistent and predictable.

So it should be clear that we all understand the strategic and economic importance of these minerals. Some of us disagree on how we should manage the extraction of these elements.

I believe that thoughtful management of these natural resources, instead of undermining important environmental protections, would actually help ensure a supply chain that is sustainable in the long term.

But this amendment addresses a different concern. Today, China has a near-monopoly in the global rare-earth element production market. According to recent estimates from the U.S. Geological Survey, China possesses 97.3 percent of the world's mine production and 55 percent of the world's rare-earth elements reserves.

At the same time, in an attempt to manipulate the world market for minerals and raise prices, the Chinese Ministry of Commerce has established strict export quotas and tariffs. Obviously, this has a real impact on the mineral supply chain for American manufacturers and businesses.

China is not acting alone. Iran is also one of the largest mineral-producing countries in the world. The director of the Persian Gulf Mining and Metal Industries Special Zone in southern Iran has said that China is their largest commercial partner. Recently, according to international reports, senior

Chinese officials have engaged with Iran on various geological research projects as they look to expand this relationship. In other words, China is already stockpiling various minerals upon which American manufacturers and our defense capabilities rely, and they may even be working with Iran to gain a larger market share. This is a real threat to our national security; but it's also a real concern for local businesses and manufacturers, technology companies, and defense contractors who rely on rare-earth elements every day.

Despite these concerns, the underlying bill fails to protect these strategic and critical minerals from exposure to foreign influence or control. That's why I rise today offering an amendment to ensure that minerals produced under this act do not become available to China, Iran, or any entity that has violated existing sanctions laws. Specifically, the amendment would ensure mine permits issued pursuant to this act include provisions prohibiting the export of the strategic and critical materials produced under the permit to China or Iran.

The amendment also prohibits issuance of permits to any company in which China or Iran has an ownership interest.

Finally, the amendment prohibits issuance of permits to any entity that has been convicted of violating the Iran Sanctions Act and related laws.

In the end, the amendment accomplishes three important goals. First, it guarantees that our own domestic resources aren't used to promote or increase Iranian or Chinese business interests at the expense of the American taxpayer. Second, it makes sure we continue pressuring Iran with economic sanctions in a sector critical to their local economy. This is a vital bipartisan national security interest. And, third, it provides more certainty for domestic manufacturers by ensuring that American minerals stay here and help make our domestic supply chain more predictable.

I urge my colleagues to support this simple amendment and to protect our country.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. AMODEI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Nevada is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. AMODEI. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Rhode Island for the eloquent description of what the underlying bill does. I tend to agree with his description on how critical this legislation is.

I am surprised at the tone, though, when we already have multiple rules, regulations, statutes on the books that talk about import and export.

I am surprised at the tone when we talk about the danger of producing these materials in this country when right now we're not producing many of them, and we are entirely reliant upon

those with whom we compete globally and militarily to attain these.

I would suggest to you that while well-intentioned, that this matter is, in fact, already taken care of under existing law; but let's not forget the underlying purpose of the bill. It's about jobs.

You want to talk about the middle class? You want to talk about the economy? You want to talk about the western half of this country where over 40 percent of many of those States are owned by the Federal Government, where people who are elected by nobody within the State are making decisions about permitting? You want to talk about permitting times and how long it takes to do that? By the way, did you hear that if it isn't grown, it has to be mined?

The purpose of this bill is to put people to work and put us back in control of supplying those minerals for the building industries, the communications industries, the manufacturing industries, all of that. By the way, not that anybody wants to trade with any of the folks mentioned in here specifically and you have the whole executive branch to take care of that, but there is that thing called "balance of trade," which is something we could use some help with.

Mr. Speaker, I urge your vote against the motion to recommit.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1730

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for an electronic vote on the question of passage.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 197, noes 229, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 470]

AYES—197

Andrews	Capps	Cooper
Barber	Capuano	Costa
Barrow (GA)	Cárdenas	Courtney
Bass	Carney	Crowley
Beatty	Carson (IN)	Cuellar
Becerra	Cartwright	Cummings
Bera (CA)	Castor (FL)	Davis (CA)
Bishop (GA)	Castro (TX)	Davis, Danny
Bishop (NY)	Chu	DeFazio
Blumenauer	Cicilline	DeGette
Bonamici	Clarke	Delaney
Brady (PA)	Clay	DeLauro
Braley (IA)	Cleaver	DelBene
Brown (FL)	Clyburn	Deutch
Brownley (CA)	Cohen	Dingell
Bustos	Connolly	Doggett
Butterfield	Conyers	Doyle

Duckworth	Levin	Rangel	Miller (MI)	Rogers (AL)	Stockman	Issa	Murphy (PA)	Scott, Austin
Edwards	Lewis	Richmond	Miller, Gary	Rogers (KY)	Stutzman	Jenkins	Neugebauer	Sensenbrenner
Ellison	Lipinski	Roybal-Allard	Mullin	Rogers (MI)	Terry	Johnson (OH)	Noem	Sessions
Engel	Loeb sack	Ruiz	Mulvaney	Rohrabacher	Thompson (PA)	Johnson, Sam	Nolan	Sewell (AL)
Enyart	Lofgren	Ruppersberger	Murphy (PA)	Rokita	Thornberry	Jones	Nugent	Shinkus
Eshoo	Lowenthal	Ryan (OH)	Neugebauer	Rooney	Tiberi	Jordan	Nunes	Shuster
Esty	Lowe y	Sánchez, Linda T.	Noem	Ros-Lehtinen	Tipton	Joyce	Nunnelee	Simpson
Farr	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Sanchez, Loretta	Nugent	Roskam	Turner	Kelly (PA)	Olson	Smith (MO)
Fattah	Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Sarbanes	Nunes	Ross	Upton	King (IA)	Owens	Smith (NE)
Foster	Lynch	Schakowsky	Nunnelee	Rothfus	Valadao	King (NY)	Palazzo	Smith (TX)
Frankel (FL)	Maffei	Schiff	Olson	Royce	Wagner	Kingston	Paulsen	Smith (TX)
Fudge	Maloney,	Schneider	Palazzo	Runyan	Walberg	Kinzinger (IL)	Pearce	Southerland
Gabbard	Carolyn	Schrader	Paulsen	Ryan (WI)	Walder	Kline	Perry	Stewart
Gallego	Maloney, Sean	Schwartz	Pearce	Salmon	Walorski	Labrador	Peterson	Stivers
Garamendi	Caroly n	Scott (VA)	Perry	Sanford	Weber (TX)	LaMalfa	Petri	Stockman
Garcia	Matheson	Scott, David	Petri	Scalise	Webster (FL)	Lamborn	Pittenger	Stutzman
Grayson	Matsui	Serrano	Pittenger	Schoc k	Wenstrup	Lance	Pitts	Terry
Green, Al	McCollum	Sewell (AL)	Pitts	Schweikert	Westmoreland	Lankford	Poe (TX)	Thompson (PA)
Green, Gene	McDermott	Shea-Porter	Poe (TX)	Sessions	Whitfield	Latham	Pompeo	Thornberry
Grijalva	McGovern	Sherman	Pompeo	Shimkus	Williams	Latta	Pos ey	Tiberi
Gutiérrez	McIntyre	Sinema	Posey	Shuster	Wilson (SC)	LoBiondo	Price (GA)	Tipton
Hahn	McNerney	Sires	Price (GA)	Simpson	Wittman	Long	Radel	Titus
Hanabusa	Meeks	Slaughter	Radel	Smith (MO)	Wolf	Lucas	Reed	Turner
Hastings (FL)	Meng	Smith (WA)	Reed	Smith (NE)	Womack	Lummis	Reichert	Upton
Heck (WA)	Michaud	Speier	Reichert	Smith (NJ)	Woodall	Marchant	Renacci	Valadao
Higgins	Miller, George	Swalwell (CA)	Renacci	Smith (TX)	Yoder	Marino	Ribble	Vela
Himes	Moore	Takano	Ribble	Southland	Yoho	Massie	Rice (SC)	Rigell
Hinojosa	Moran	Thompson (CA)	Rice (SC)	Stewart	Young (AK)	Matheson	Rigell	Wagner
Holt	Murphy (FL)	Thompson (MS)	Rigell	Stivers	Young (FL)	McCarthy (CA)	Roby	Walberg
Honda	Nadler	Tierney	Roby		Young (IN)	McCaul	Roe (TN)	Walden
Horsford	Napolitano	Titus	Roe (TN)			McClintock	Rogers (AL)	Walorski
Hoyer	Neal	Tonko				McHenry	Rogers (KY)	Weber (TX)
Huffman	Negrete McLeod	Tsongas	Brady (TX)	Jeffries	Polis	McIntyre	Rogers (MI)	Webster (FL)
Israel	Nolan	Van Hollen	Herrera Beutler	McCarthy (NY)	Rush	McKeon	Rohrabacher	Wenstrup
Jackson Lee	O'Rourke	Vargas				McKinley	Rokita	Westmoreland
Johnson (GA)	Owens	Veasey				McMorris	Rooney	Whitfield
Johnson, E. B.	Pallone	Vela				Rodgers	Ros-Lehtinen	Williams
Jones	Pascarell	Velázquez				Meadows	Roskam	Wilson (SC)
Kaptur	Pastor (AZ)	Visclosky				Ross	Rothfus	Wittman
Keating	Payne	Walz				Meehan	Royce	Wolf
Kelly (IL)	Pelosi	Wasserman				Meng	Runyan	Womack
Kennedy	Perlmutter	Schultz				Messer	Ryan (WI)	Woodall
Kildee	Peters (CA)	Waters				Mica	Salmon	Yoder
Kilmer	Peters (MI)	Watt				Miller (FL)	Sanford	Yoho
Kind	Peterson	Waxman				Miller (MI)	Scalise	Young (AK)
Kirkpatrick	Pingree (ME)	Welch				Miller, Gary	Schock	Young (FL)
Kuster	Pocan	Wilson (FL)				Mullin	Schweikert	Young (IN)
Langevin	Price (NC)	Yarmuth				Mulvaney		
Larsen (WA)	Quigley							
Larson (CT)	Rahall							
Lee (CA)								

NOT VOTING—6

□ 1735

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 246, noes 178, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 471]

AYES—246

Aderholt	Denham	Hudson	Coble	Frelinghuysen
Alexander	Dent	Huelskamp	Coffman	Gallego
Amash	DeSantis	Huizenga (MI)	Cole	Gardner
Amodei	DesJarlais	Hultgren	Collins (GA)	Garrett
Bachmann	Diaz-Balart	Hunter	Collins (NY)	Gerlach
Bachus	Duffy	Hurt	Conaway	Gibbs
Balretta	Duncan (SC)	Issa	Cook	Gibson
Barr	Duncan (TN)	Jenkins	Costa	Gingrey (GA)
Barton	Ellmers	Johnson (OH)	Cotton	Gohmert
Benishek	Farenthold	Johnson, Sam	Cramer	Goodlatte
Bentivolio	Fincher	Jordan	Crawford	Gosar
Bilirakis	Fitzpatrick	Joyce	Crenshaw	Govdy
Bishop (UT)	Fliebschmann	Kelly (PA)	Cuellar	Granger
Black	Fleming	King (IA)	Culberson	Graves (GA)
Blackburn	Flores	King (NY)	Daines	Graves (MO)
Boustany	Forbes	Kingston	Davis, Rodney	Griffin (AR)
Bridenstine	Fortenberry	Kinzinger (IL)	Denham	Griffith (VA)
Brooks (AL)	Foxx	Kline	Dent	Grimm
Brooks (IN)	Franks (AZ)	Labrador	DeSantis	Guthrie
Broun (GA)	Frelinghuysen	LaMalfa	DesJarlais	Hall
Buchanan	Gardner	Lamborn	Diaz-Balart	Hanna
Bucshon	Garrett	Lance	Duffy	Harper
Burgess	Gerlach	Lankford	Duncan (SC)	Harris
Calvert	Gibbs	Latham	Duncan (TN)	Hartzler
Camp	Gibson	Latta	Ellmers	Hastings (WA)
Campbell	Gingrey (GA)	LoBiondo	Farenthold	Heck (NV)
Cantor	Gohmert	Long	Fincher	Hensarling
Capito	Goodlatte	Lucas	Fitzpatrick	Holding
Carter	Gosar	Luetkemeyer	Fleischmann	Horsford
Cassidy	Govdy	Lummis	Fleming	Hudson
Chabot	Granger	Marchant	Floures	Huelskamp
Chaffetz	Graves (GA)	Marino	Forbes	Huizenga (MI)
Coble	Graves (MO)	Massie	Fortenberry	Hultgren
Coffman	Griffin (AR)	McCarthy (CA)	Foxx	Hunter
Cole	Griffith (VA)	McCaul	Franks (AZ)	Hurt
Collins (GA)	Grimm	McClintock		
Collins (NY)	Guthrie	McHenry		
Conaway	Hall	McKeon		
Cook	Hanna	McKinley		
Cotton	Harper	McMorris		
Cramer	Harris	Rodgers		
Crawford	Hartzler	Meadows		
Crenshaw	Hastings (WA)	Meehan		
Culberson	Heck (NV)	Messer		
Daines	Hensarling	Mica		
Davis, Rodney	Holding	Miller (FL)		
Andrews	Enyart	Lowenthal		
Barber	Eshoo	Lowe y		
Bass	Esty	Lujan Grisham (NM)		
Beatty	Farr	Luján, Ben Ray (NM)		
Becerra	Fattah	Lynch		
Bera (CA)	Foster	Maffei		
Bishop (NY)	Frankel (FL)	Maloney,		
Bonamici	Fudge	Carolyn		
Brady (PA)	Gabbard	Maloney, Sean		
Braley (IA)	Garamendi	Matsui		
Brown (FL)	Garcia	McCollum		
Brownley (CA)	Grayson	McDermott		
Bustos	Green, Al	McGovern		
Butterfield	Green, Gene	McNerney		
Capps	Grijalva	Michaud		
Capuano	Gutiérrez	Miller, George		
Cárdenas	Hahn	Moore		
Carson (IN)	Hanabusa	Moran		
Cartwright	Hastings (FL)	Murphy (FL)		
Castor (FL)	Heck (WA)	Nadler		
Castro (TX)	Higgins	Napolitano		
Chu	Himes	Neal		
Cicilline	Hinojosa	Negrete McLeod		
Clarke	Holt	O'Rourke		
Clay	Honda	Pallone		
Cleaver	Hoyer	Pascarell		
Clyburn	Huffman	Pastor (AZ)		
Cohen	Israel	Payne		
Connolly	Jackson Lee	Pelosi		
Conyers	Johnson (GA)	Perlmutter		
Cooper	Johnson, E. B.	Peters (CA)		
Courtney	Kaptur	Peters (MI)		
Crowley	Keating	Pingree (ME)		
Cummings	Kelly (IL)	Pocan		
Davis (CA)	Kennedy	Price (NC)		
Davis, Danny	Kildee	Quigley		
DeFazio	Kilmer	Rahall		
DeGette	Kind	Rangel		
Delaney	Kirkpatrick	Richmond		
DeLauro	Kuster	Roybal-Allard		
DelBene	Langevin	Ruiz		
Deutch	Larsen (WA)	Ruppersberger		
Dingell	Larson (CT)	Ryan (OH)		
Doggett	Lee (CA)	Sánchez, Linda T.		
Doyle	Lewis	Sarbanes		
Duckworth	Lipinski			
Edwards	Loeb sack			
Ellison	Lofgren			
Engel				

Schakowsky	Slaughter	Veasey
Schiff	Smith (WA)	Velázquez
Schneider	Speier	Visclosky
Schrader	Swalwell (CA)	Walz
Schwartz	Takano	Wasserman
Scott (VA)	Thompson (CA)	Schultz
Scott, David	Thompson (MS)	Waters
Serrano	Tierney	Watt
Shea-Porter	Tonko	Waxman
Sherman	Tsongas	Welch
Sinema	Van Hollen	Wilson (FL)
Sires	Vargas	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—8

Blumenauer	Jeffries	Polis
Carney	McCarthy (NY)	Rush
Herrera Beutler	Meeks	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1742

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO BE CONSIDERED AS FIRST SPONSOR OF H.R. 1507

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may hereafter be considered to be the first sponsor of H.R. 1507, a bill originally introduced by Representative MARKEY of Massachusetts, for the purposes of adding cosponsors and requesting reprintings pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

ELECTING A MEMBER TO A CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 349

Resolved, That the following named Member be and is hereby elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

(1) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE.—Mr. Yarmuth.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1745

WATER FOR THE WORLD

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in developing countries, access to clean water isn't as easy as walking over to the kitchen faucet.

Communities suffer and die from diseases they contract from bad water. And in their search for life's basic need, they put themselves in harm's way.

In Third World countries, women walk miles to wells to find clean water; but some wells are controlled by criminals who brutally assault these innocent women right in front of their own kids. And then they must then buy the water.

We have the ability to help these countries that don't have access to clean water. We can help them dig wells, for example. That's why Congressman EARL BLUMENAUER and I have introduced the Water for the World Act. This bill uses existing taxpayer money more effectively by making water available and a priority in Third World countries.

I'd like to thank Congressman BLUMENAUER for his relentless efforts, and the groups who advocate for Water for the World.

No one on Earth should be assaulted just to obtain clean water on a daily basis.

And that's just the way it is.

CUTS TO THE SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to point out the near-universal condemnation that the majority's wrong-headed plan to cut \$40 billion from food stamps has received from advocates, researchers, and American families.

The Center for Budget and Policy Priorities has noted how 170,000 veterans could lose access to food aid because of this act.

The National Education Association said this plan will "result in more than 210,000 children losing access to nutritious meals, which help children be more attentive in class."

AARP condemns this bill saying "hungry children, seniors and families cannot and should not have to wait on the economic and political sidelines for access to an effective nutrition safety net."

Homeless organizations have said this act will "worsen the lives of up to 4 million Americans who are either homeless already or whose risk of homelessness would become even more severe."

The Catholic Bishops have said this bill will "harm hungry children, poor families, vulnerable citizens, seniors and workers who are underemployed and unable to find employment."

The list of opposition to tomorrow's bill goes on, even from Republican leaders like Senator Bob Dole.

I urge all members of conscience in the majority to join with us tomorrow to vote down this cruel legislation.

WE MUST REFORM ENTITLEMENT PROGRAMS TO SAVE THEM

(Mrs. LUMMIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Speaker, the Congressional Budget Office informed us again yesterday what we already know about our job here in Congress, which is that we must reform entitlement programs in order to save them.

We must save them so we can save ourselves from this unsustainable debt and deficit which faces us; and further, that if we are to do it by raising taxes, it will erode the economic recovery that we're already just beginning to have.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Senate Democrats to adopt the House Republican budget which will balance in 10 years, which will address our unsustainable debt and deficit, and put us on the road to recovery.

SEQUESTRATION

(Mr. BARBER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, because of the proposed sequestration cuts, the Air Force is considering the complete retirement of entire fleets of aircraft, including the A-10 Warthog. The A-10 is unsurpassed in its ability to provide close-air combat support for our troops on the ground.

In Iraq and Afghanistan, the A-10 performed one-third of the combat sorties. One Army commander told me that whenever he heard the Warthogs overhead, he knew that their day was going to get better.

The A-10 is a multi-role plane that assists in combat search-and-rescue operations, escorting helicopters through the toughest combat zones. Its wings and electronics package have been completely refitted so that its mission can continue for at least another 15 years.

Sequestration is a disgrace. I never supported it, and I implore my colleagues to work with me to end it. Our national security and the protection of our servicemembers in combat areas must be paramount as we fund the Department of Defense.

Mr. Speaker, we must stop the irresponsible sequestration cuts and keep the A-10 flying.

BENGHAZI ATTACK INVESTIGATION

(Mr. PERRY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, Under Secretary Kennedy made this statement at the House Foreign Affairs Committee meeting today:

The Department has demonstrated an unprecedented degree of cooperation and engagement with the Congress on these issues,

especially following the attack in Benghazi. To date, the Department has provided to the Congress the classified ARB report and more than 25,000 pages of documents.

Secretary Kerry, testifying before the House Foreign Affairs Committee in April, also pledged coordination with the Benghazi investigation when he stated:

I'm determined that this will be as accountable and open State Department as it has been in the past and we will continue to provide answers.

So the question I have for each of them is this: Why do I have to hold in my hands a handwritten transcript of an email?

Why is it that congressional investigators must hand-copy them under supervision from the other side, so to speak?

Why can't we get the documents and copy themselves?

Why must we subpoena everything?

And why are they not in compliance with any of the subpoenas?

PROPOSED SNAP CUTS

(Mr. TONKO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, more than 30,000 families in New York's capital region rely on SNAP benefits to put dinner on the table every night. Nationally, about 87 percent of families on food stamps include a child, a senior citizen, or a disabled person. These members of the American family are hungry. They are not criminals.

Yet House Republicans are trying to cut \$40 billion from this critical program, 10 times the amount the Senate has proposed, without first looking at closing tax loopholes for major corporations or cutting subsidies to profit rich oil companies.

These benefits are not luxuries, Mr. Speaker. These are basic, sustainable meals that will keep our unemployed and underemployed nourished until they find a job that lets them support themselves and their families on their own.

If House Republicans truly want to reduce food stamp rolls and decrease how much our Nation spends on the SNAP program, then they need to join the Democrats and get serious about creating quality, well-paying jobs instead of trying to balance the budget on the backs of our country's most vulnerable.

HONORING THE LIVING CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR RECIPIENTS

(Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, thank you for the opportunity to be here today. It is an honor for me, as a new Member of Congress, to sit here on the floor of the House

with my colleagues to actually honor all of our living Congressional Medal of Honor recipients.

I'm proud to work with my colleague, TULSI GABBARD, from the great State of Hawaii, in a bipartisan way to make sure that these heroes that protected our freedoms, that have protected our ability to stand here and debate the issues that we debate every single day, are honored by their heroism and by their fight for this country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we're going to begin this process through the 1-minute, but we're also going to have an hour and a half of a Special Order that's going to be a bipartisan, unprecedented Special Order to honor these American heroes. And I stand here today to say thank you to each and every one of them.

RECOGNITION OF IMMIGRATION REFORM, CONSTITUTION DAY, CITIZENSHIP DAY, AND CONSTITUTION WEEK

(Mr. HONDA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I just want to thank my colleague, Congressman CÁRDENAS, for bringing everyone together to support immigration reform and in recognition of Constitution Day, Citizenship Day, and Constitution Week.

From Angel Island to Ellis Island, from our northern to southern borders, from the fertile earth of Steinbeck country, to innovation's epicenter of Silicon Valley, immigration issues and immigrants have touched every corner and facet of our Nation.

As the Representative of California's 17th District, I have witnessed how this immigrant spirit is the entrepreneur's spirit. In fact, 40 percent of the largest U.S. companies have been founded by immigrants or their children.

In Silicon Valley, between 1995 and 2005, more than half of all the major technology and engineering firms were founded by an immigrant.

People come to our shores with different dreams, aspirations, and needs. We must support stronger provisions for those guest workers who toil the earth and harvest food for our dinner tables. We must support students who come to this country seeking top education and then allow them to kindle their entrepreneurial spark into our economy.

We must support high-skilled immigrants, as well as their families, who will strengthen our talented workforce. We must never turn our backs on our married children and siblings just because they are above a certain age.

HONORING COLONEL WESLEY LEE FOX

(Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. I join with my colleagues to honor those recipients of the Medal of Honor.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Colonel Wesley Lee Fox of the United States Marine Corps. Colonel Fox currently resides in Blacksburg, Virginia.

Colonel Fox was awarded the Medal of Honor for gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty in the Republic of Vietnam.

Colonel Fox's company came under intense fire from a large, well-concealed enemy force. Colonel Fox was wounded, along with the other members of the command group. Colonel Fox personally neutralized one enemy position and calmly ordered an assault against the hostile emplacements.

Colonel Fox refused medical attention so he could establish a defensive posture and supervise the preparation of casualties for medical evacuation. His indomitable courage, inspiring initiative, and unwavering devotion to duty in the face of grave personal danger inspired his marines to such aggressive action that they overcame all enemy resistance and destroyed a large bunker complex.

It is for his outstanding heroism and leadership that I am proud and honored to remember the actions of Colonel Wesley L. Fox.

HONORING STAFF SERGEANT ALLAN JAY KELLOGG, JR.

(Ms. GABBARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, I'm so proud to stand here today to join Congressman RODNEY DAVIS from Illinois and the rest of my colleagues as we honor the 79 living Medal of Honor recipients, which include U.S. Marine Corps Staff Sergeant Allan Jay Kellogg, who's lived in Hawaii for more than 25 years, and who calls my hometown of Kailua his home as well.

Under the leadership of Sergeant Kellogg, a small unit from Company G was evacuating a fallen comrade when the unit came under enemy fire from the surrounding jungle. What he did is the stuff of legend.

After an enemy soldier hurled a hand grenade at the marines, Sergeant Kellogg quickly forced the grenade into the mud, threw himself over the grenade, and absorbed the full effects of its detonation with his body, saving his unit. Although suffering multiple injuries to his chest and his right shoulder, Sergeant Kellogg continued to direct his men until all reached safety.

It's for his unwavering devotion to duty and his continued service to our country that I'm so proud to honor and remember the actions of Staff Sergeant Allan Jay Kellogg, Jr. here today.

□ 1800

HONORING COLONEL OLA LEE MIZE

(Mr. ADERHOLT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the heroic actions of Congressional Medal of Honor recipient Ola Lee Mize of Gadsden, Alabama, who resides in the Fourth Congressional District, which I'm honored to represent.

Colonel Mize was with the 3rd Infantry Division and was awarded the Medal of Honor for outstanding courage in action on June 10 and 11, 1953, in Korea. His company was responsible for the defense of a vital position that was attacked by a well-organized enemy force. Colonel Mize charged through an intense barrage of fire to rescue a friend who had fallen. Following the successful rescue, Colonel Mize returned to his post and dug in. Although under duress, Colonel Mize held the line, fighting to keep his men safe. Colonel Mize protected his fellow soldiers, called in artillery support, and led a successful counterattack.

It is for his unflinching courage and valor that I'm proud to honor and remember the actions of Colonel Ola Lee Mize. The Fourth District of Alabama, the State of Alabama, and the United States Congress is very honored to recognize the work that he did in Korea.

HONORING COLONEL ROBERT JOSEPH MODRZEJEWSKI AND COLONEL JAY VARGAS

(Mr. PETERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise today to honor the heroic efforts in Vietnam of two veterans of the United States Marine Corps who today call San Diego their home: Colonel Robert Joseph Modrzejewski and Colonel Jay Vargas.

Colonel Modrzejewski was the commanding officer of Company K and was awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry in action in Vietnam. Though wounded, he refused to allow his men to be overrun during an attack on a well-fortified enemy in a superior position. Though they sustained many casualties, Colonel Modrzejewski and his men were successful in repelling the enemy.

Colonel Vargas served as commanding officer of Company G and was awarded the Medal of Honor for his extraordinary heroism in action. Although wounded, Colonel Vargas led his men in an emboldened attack on heavily defended enemy forces. On the second day, Colonel Vargas saw his battalion commander go down and, after advancing to his position, carried him to safety.

For their unparalleled heroism and gallantry in action, exemplifying the spirit of the Marine Corps, I'm proud to honor and remember the actions of Colonel Modrzejewski and Colonel Vargas.

HONORING SERGEANT DAKOTA L. MEYER

(Mr. WHITFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Marine Sergeant Dakota L. Meyer.

Sergeant Meyer was a scout sniper with the 3rd Marines and was awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry in action on September 8, 2009, in Afghanistan. While maintaining security at a patrol rally point, an element of Sergeant Meyer's team was moving on foot through a village. When they were ambushed, Sergeant Meyer and a fellow marine raced to provide additional support for the ambushed squad.

Despite concentrated enemy assaults, Meyer made two trips into the ambush area to evacuate two-dozen Afghan soldiers. He was then wounded by gunfire. After that, he made additional trips into the ambush area to recover additional wounded soldiers, and provided fire to help the remaining U.S. and Afghan soldiers fight their way out of the ambush. For his heroic efforts, Dakota L. Meyer was awarded the Medal of Honor on September 8, 2009.

When Douglas MacArthur gave his farewell speech to West Point, it was entitled, "Duty, Honor, Country." I think those three words reflect the efforts of Dakota L. Meyer and his entire team.

Today, I pay tribute to Dakota L. Meyer of the First Congressional District of Kentucky.

HONORING STAFF SERGEANT TY MICHAEL CARTER

(Mr. HECK of Washington asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, four of the 79 living Congressional Medal of Honor recipients live in the congressional district that I have the great honor to represent. I will speak on three tonight.

I rise first to honor the incredible courage and outstanding heroism of Staff Sergeant Ty Michael Carter of the United States Army—America's newest Congressional Medal of Honor recipient.

Staff Sergeant Carter was a cavalry scout with Bravo Troop and was awarded the Medal of Honor for extreme bravery in action on October 3, 2009, in Afghanistan. On the morning of October 3, Sergeant Carter's outpost came under heavy and intense fire from all sides. Staff Sergeant Carter charged to an exposed forward position and provided deadly suppressive fire into the oncoming enemy attack, stalling their advance. When a fellow soldier was critically wounded, Staff Sergeant Carter, though wounded as well, courageously charged again through the enemy onslaught to provide aid to his comrade. Sergeant Carter's heroic ac-

tions and tactical skill were central to beating back the enemy offensive and saving numerous lives.

It is for his incomprehensible courage that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Staff Sergeant Ty Michael Carter, a resident of Yelm, Washington.

HONORING COMMAND SERGEANT MAJOR ROBERT MARTIN PATTERSON

(Mr. MILLER of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Command Sergeant Major Robert Martin Patterson of the United States Army.

Command Sergeant Major Patterson was a fire team leader of the 3rd Platoon, 17th Cavalry Regiment, and was awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry in action on May 6, 1968, in Vietnam. When the 3rd Platoon became pinned down by interlocking enemy fire and rocket-propelled grenades, Command Sergeant Major Patterson led two men in quickly silencing an enemy bunker with rifle and grenade assaults.

When Command Sergeant Major Patterson noticed the enemy engaging his men from hidden spider holes, he entered the complex and single-handedly conducted an assault on their position. In so doing, the sergeant major successfully destroyed five enemy bunkers, killing eight and capturing seven enemy weapons.

It is for his dauntless courage and heroism that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Command Sergeant Major Robert Martin Patterson.

HONORING LIEUTENANT COLONEL ALFRED VELAZQUEZ RASCON

(Mr. WALZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Lieutenant Colonel Alfred Velazquez Rascon of the United States Army.

Lieutenant Rascon was a medic with the 173rd Airborne and was awarded the Medal of Honor for extraordinary courage in action on March 16, 1966, in Vietnam. The following is directly from his commendation:

Disregarding heavy enemy fire, Lieutenant Colonel Rascon rushed to the aid of wounded machine gunners and placed himself as a shield between himself and the enemy. After saving two men, he entered the line of enemy fire to retrieve an abandoned machine-gun, allowing for suppressing fire while he treated the wounded. When the sergeant of the platoon went down with injuries, Lieutenant Colonel Rascon once again placed himself as a shield between the wounded man and the enemy. Although sustaining multiple wounds himself, Lieutenant Colonel Rascon refused to leave the field until the last had been treated.

Lieutenant Colonel Rascon came out of retirement and joined the United States Army Reserves and served this Nation in both Iraq and Afghanistan in our recent conflicts.

It is for his amazing valor and heroism that I am proud and humbled to honor and remember the actions of Lieutenant Colonel Alfred Velazquez Rascon.

HONORING SERGEANT ROBERT EMMETT O'MALLEY

(Mr. CONAWAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Marine Corps Sergeant Robert Emmett O'Malley of Goldthwaite, Texas.

Sergeant O'Malley was a squad leader with Company I, 3rd Marines, during the Vietnam War, and was awarded the Medal of Honor for supreme bravery in action on August 18, 1965.

Sergeant O'Malley's unit came under heavy enemy fire while conducting an amphibious assault on an enemy position during Operation Starlite. Disregarding his own safety, Sergeant O'Malley charged forward and killed eight enemy soldiers. Then he directed his men to fire on the enemy, with deadly effect. He also rallied his squad to help an adjacent Marine unit suffering heavy casualties.

Although he was wounded, Sergeant O'Malley refused to allow medics to treat him, insisting instead on helping evacuate wounded marines. After being wounded a third time, Sergeant O'Malley refused to yield the engagement until all of his men were accounted for.

It is for his valor, leadership, and courageous efforts on behalf of fellow marines that I am proud to represent Sergeant Robert Emmett O'Malley of the 11th Congressional District of Texas.

HONORING CAPTAIN PAUL WILLIAM BUCHA

(Mr. HIMES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, I'm thrilled tonight to join my colleagues in honoring these extraordinary men and women who have been awarded the Medal of Honor.

I rise today to honor the manifest bravery and courage of my constituent, Captain Paul William Bucha of the United States Army, Ridgefield, Connecticut.

Captain Bucha was awarded the Medal of Honor for gallantry in action during March 16-19, 1968, in Vietnam. For 3 days, on a mission to seek and destroy enemy positions, Captain Bucha led his 89-man unit through intense combat. On March 18, a North Vietnamese battalion with numerical su-

periority pinned down the forward units of his company. When Captain Bucha discovered the origins of the heaviest fire, he maneuvered into position and single-handedly eliminated the enemy position. Due to his exceptional leadership and guidance during the 3-day engagement, Captain Bucha's men held their position, refused to yield, and inflicted considerable casualties upon the superior enemy force.

It is for his extraordinary heroism and exemplary leadership that I'm proud to honor and remember the actions of Captain Paul William Bucha.

HONORING LIEUTENANT COLONEL JAMES MICHAEL SPRAYBERRY

(Mrs. ROBY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Lieutenant Colonel James Michael Sprayberry of the United States Army.

Raised in Sylacauga, Alabama, he joined the Army in Montgomery, Alabama, in 1967. Lieutenant Sprayberry was just 21 years old and serving with the 1st Cavalry Division in Vietnam when, on April 25, 1968, he engaged in extraordinary acts of heroism for which he was awarded the Medal of Honor.

On that day, his company commander and many of his fellow soldiers were wounded and separated from the unit. When a daytime rescue attempt was deterred by entrenched enemy machine-gun fire, Lieutenant Colonel Sprayberry organized and led a nighttime patrol to eliminate the enemy fire and rescue his fellow surrounded soldiers.

When the patrol came under intense enemy machine-gun fire, he single-handedly conducted multiple attacks against multiple enemy machine-gun bunkers and eliminated them one by one with hand grenades. After destroying bunkers, he was able to direct the isolated men to safety. The operation was a resounding success and resulted in the safe return of many fellow soldiers.

It is for his conspicuous gallantry and indomitable spirit that I am proud to honor the actions of Lieutenant Colonel James Michael Sprayberry.

HONORING STAFF SERGEANT HIROSHI H. MIYAMURA

(Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Staff Sergeant Hiroshi H. Miyamura of the United States Army, who called Gallup, New Mexico, home.

Sergeant Miyamura was with the 3rd Infantry Division and was awarded the Medal of Honor for extreme bravery in

action from April 24-25, 1951, near Taejon-ni, Korea. Staff Sergeant Miyamura's company was holding a defensive position when a strong enemy force launched a surprise attack to overrun them. Understanding the severity of the situation, Staff Sergeant Miyamura hustled to the line and plunged into the oncoming enemy forces with his bayonet, killing 10 of the attackers.

During the second assault, he used his machine-gun, taking out the enemy. He insisted that his men pull back while he covered their withdrawal. While unloading on the enemy's advances, Staff Sergeant Miyamura killed at least 50 and provided a safe withdrawal of his unit.

It is for his heroism and distinguished service that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Staff Sergeant Hiroshi H. Miyamura.

HONORING CORPORAL RODOLFO PEREZ "RUDY" HERNANDEZ

(Mrs. ELLMERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Corporal Rodolfo Perez "Rudy" Hernandez of the United States Army.

Corporal Hernandez was with Company G, 187th Airborne Regimental Combat Team, and was awarded the Medal of Honor for visible gallantry in action on May 31, 1951 in Korea. His platoon was in a defensive position on Hill 420 when it came under heavy attack by enemy forces. Although his comrades were forced to withdraw, Corporal Hernandez stood his ground. When his machine-gun jammed, he valiantly charged with rifle and bayonet straight into the attacking force and he was seriously injured by a grenade blast. Due to Corporal Hernandez's heroic charge, the enemy advance was stalled long enough for his unit to mount a counteroffensive and retake the hill.

It is for this extraordinary courage in action that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Corporal Rodolfo Perez Hernandez.

□ 1815

HONORING MAJOR FREDERICK EDGAR FERGUSON

(Ms. SINEMA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Major Frederick Edgar Ferguson of the United States Army. Major Ferguson served in the 1st Cavalry Division and was awarded the Medal of Honor for supreme gallantry in action on January 31, 1968, in the Republic of Vietnam. Today he lives in Chandler, Arizona, in the district I have the honor of representing.

Major Ferguson was the commander of a helicopter monitoring an emergency call from wounded passengers of a downed helicopter under heavy attack. Without hesitation, Major Ferguson volunteered to respond to the call despite warnings to stay clear of the area.

Major Ferguson displayed superior flying skill by landing his aircraft under heavy fire. And although the helicopter sustained severe damage as the wounded men boarded, Major Ferguson flew his crippled aircraft to safety. That day, Major Ferguson saved the lives of five fellow servicemen with his brave and selfless act.

It is for his outstanding display of bravery that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Major Frederick Edgar Ferguson.

Thank you, Major Ferguson.

HONORING SPECIALIST FOURTH CLASS FRANK A. HERDA

(Mr. RENACCI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RENACCI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Specialist Fourth Class Frank A. Herda of the United States Army.

Specialist Herda was with Company A, 506th Infantry Regiment of the 101st Airborne Division and was awarded the Medal of Honor for extreme bravery in action on January 29, 1968, in Vietnam.

When five enemy soldiers charged the position held by Specialist Herda and two fellow soldiers, one of the attacker's grenades landed amongst the men. Without hesitating, Specialist Herda threw himself on it, shielding the blast with his body. Specialist Herda's valiant and selfless actions saved the lives of his two comrades.

For his extraordinary bravery and commitment, I am proud today to honor and remember the actions of Specialist Frank A. Herda.

HONORING STAFF SERGEANT SALVATORE AUGUSTINE GIUNTA

(Mr. ENYART asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ENYART. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Staff Sergeant Salvatore Augustine Giunta of the United States Army. Staff Sergeant Giunta was with the 173rd Airborne Brigade Combat Team and was awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry in action on October 25, 2007, in Afghanistan.

Staff Sergeant Giunta and his team were ambushed by heavy enemy fire. After sprinting for cover and returning fire, Staff Sergeant Giunta raced to his wounded squad leader to assist him. While disregarding the withering enemy fire, Staff Sergeant Giunta continued to assist the wounded and link up with men separated from his unit.

When he observed two insurgents carrying away one of his men, this staff sergeant charged their position, killing one enemy and wounding the other. He then carried his comrade away from the exposed position and began to administer first aid before his squad caught up to provide security.

It is for his extreme heroism and valor that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Staff Sergeant Salvatore A. Giunta.

HONORING TECHNICAL SERGEANT CHARLES HENRY COOLIDGE

(Mr. FLEISCHMANN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FLEISCHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Signal Mountain, Tennessee, resident Technical Sergeant Charles Henry Coolidge of the United States Army. Technical Sergeant Coolidge was with the 36th Infantry Division and was awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry in action on October 24, 1944, near Belmont-sur-Buttant, France.

As Technical Sergeant Coolidge led a platoon to cover part of the 3rd Battalion, they ran into an enemy force and engaged in a fierce firefight. With no officer present, Technical Sergeant Coolidge assumed command of the new replacements and led his men through 3 days of hard fighting. Armed with a bazooka, he advanced within 25 yards of the tanks before it failed to function. Then, gathering as many hand grenades as he could, he inflicted heavy casualties upon the enemy.

It is for his superior leadership and bravery that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Technical Sergeant Charles Henry Coolidge.

HONORING LIEUTENANT COLONEL LEO THORSNESS

(Mr. BROOKS of Alabama asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to tell the story of a courageous Congressional Medal of Honor recipient living in Alabama's Fifth Congressional District.

Pilot Lieutenant Colonel Leo Thorsness was on a mission over North Vietnam when he lost his wingman. As the crew members parachuted to the ground, Colonel Thorsness destroyed a MIG-17 that was threatening their safety. Low on fuel, Colonel Thorsness went in search of a refueling tanker, but upon hearing that the downed men were again threatened—this time by four MIGs—he immediately returned to their aid. Low on fuel and perilously close to crashing himself, Colonel Thorsness attacked the four MIGs, damaging one, driving them away, and saving the downed men and their rescuers. Then he flew further afield to refuel, aiding another plane that needed the emergency fueling station.

Lieutenant Colonel Thorsness' extraordinary heroism, self-sacrifice, and

personal bravery saved many lives, and our Nation is forever grateful for his service.

HONORING SPECIALIST FOURTH CLASS JOHN PHILIP BACA

(Mr. COTTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Specialist Fourth Class John Philip Baca of the United States Army.

Specialist Baca was a member of the 1st Cavalry Division, the "First Team." His Medal of Honor was awarded for extraordinary bravery in action on February 10, 1970, in Vietnam. On that February day, a platoon from Specialist Baca's company came under enemy fire. Upon realizing his team could be of assistance, Specialist Baca jumped into action. He led his unit through enemy fire to a position within the patrol's defensive perimeter. But before they were able to attack, an enemy grenade was thrown directly into their unit. Specialist Baca covered the grenade with his helmet and fell on it, absorbing its blast. His quick action bravely saved eight of his fellow soldiers from death or serious injury.

It is for this brave act and his unwavering courage that I am proud to honor the actions of Specialist Fourth Class John Philip Baca.

HONORING STAFF SERGEANT CLINTON ROMESHA

(Mr. CRAMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the heroic efforts of former Staff Sergeant Clinton Romesha of the United States Army. Staff Sergeant Romesha was with the 4th Infantry Division and awarded the Medal of Honor for his acts of gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his own life in Afghanistan on October 3, 2009.

Attacked by an estimated 300 Taliban fighters, Staff Sergeant Romesha moved uncovered to conduct a reconnaissance and seek reinforcements. Romesha took out one enemy machine gun team and was wounded attempting to take out the second. Despite his wounds he continued fighting and directed air support, resulting in the elimination of over 30 enemy fighters.

Clint, his wife Tamara, and their three children—Dessi, Gwen, and Colin—live in Minot, North Dakota, and are the pride of our State.

It is for his extraordinary heroism and resolute commitment to his fellow soldiers that I am proud to honor Staff Sergeant Clinton Romesha.

HONORING CORPORAL DUANE EDGAR DEWEY

(Mr. STEWART asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Corporal Duane Edgar Dewey of the United States Marine Corps. Corporal Dewey was with the First Marine Division and was awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry in action on April 16, 1952, near Panmunjom, Korea.

While receiving medical attention for his own wounds after a fierce night attack by a numerically superior and aggressive enemy force, an enemy grenade landed close to the position of Corporal Dewey and his fellow soldiers. Disregarding his own safety and intense pain, Corporal Dewey pulled his corpsman to the ground, shouted a warning to other marines, and covered the grenade with his own body, absorbing the explosion and saving his comrades from possible injury or death.

It is for his indomitable heroism and consummate devotion to duty that I am proud to honor and to remember the actions of Corporal Duane Edgar Dewey.

FORT HOOD HEROES ACT

(Mr. CARTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, this is a nice evening to be introducing what I have to say. This Roll Call of Heroes is inspiring to any and all Americans, including myself.

Yesterday I dropped into the hopper a bill entitled Fort Hood Heroes Act, H.R. 3111. This bill was introduced with 119 original cosponsors on a bipartisan basis.

This bill declares the shooting that took place at Fort Hood an act of terrorism that should have been prevented and that Nidal Hasan was an Islamic extremist. The bill would award Purple Hearts to the soldiers who were killed or wounded in the attack, and award the Secretary of Defense Medal of Freedom to civilians who were killed or wounded in the attack.

This bill would provide benefits to the victims of the attack who were killed or wounded and their families, deeming the killing or wounding to have occurred:

For soldiers, in a combat zone and at the hands of an enemy of the United States;

For civilian DOD employees, by hostile action while serving alongside the Armed Forces during a contingency operation and in a terrorist attack.

The possible benefits they will receive will be:

Combat-related special compensation;

Maximum coverage under Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance;

Tax breaks after death in combat zone or terrorist attack;

Special pay for subjection to hostile fire or imminent danger;

Unearned portions of bonuses;
Combat-related injury rehabilitation pay; and
Meals at military treatment facilities.

HONORING MAJOR DREW DENNIS DIX

(Mr. TIPTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Major Drew Dennis Dix of the United States Army who hails from the hometown of heroes, Pueblo, Colorado. Major Dix was a military adviser for the Army of the Republic of Vietnam and was awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry in action on January 31, 1968.

Major Dix led a force to rescue trapped civilians from a city. When the rescue team entered the city, they were greeted with intense automatic rifle fire and machine gun fire from the Vietcong. Major Dix personally engaged and killed six Vietcong in a building where two civilians were trapped. The following day, Dix assembled a 20-man force to clear the Vietcong out of the city. The group captured 20 and attacked several who had entered the residence of the deputy province chief, successfully rescuing the official's wife and children.

It is for this indomitable heroism and supreme bravery that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Major Drew Dennis Dix.

HONORING LIEUTENANT COLONEL RONALD ERIC RAY

(Mr. BILIRAKIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the heroic efforts of Lieutenant Colonel Ronald Eric Ray of the United States Army. Lieutenant Colonel Ray, who lives in Tarpon Springs, Florida, was a platoon leader in the 25th Infantry Division and was awarded the Medal of Honor for profound bravery in action on June 19, 1969, in Vietnam.

When one of his patrol teams was ambushed, Lieutenant Colonel Ray set up a defensive perimeter while eliminating multiple Vietcong positions with grenades and rifle fire. Lieutenant Colonel Ray then began directing air and medical support into the area. When a grenade fell between two of his men, he threw himself upon it, shielding them from the blast, but sustaining multiple shrapnel wounds himself. Though wounded, Lieutenant Colonel Ray remained on the field and provided effective fire support until the last of his men were safely extracted.

It is for his courage and commitment to his men that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Lieutenant Colonel Ronald Eric Ray.

□ 1830

HONORING SPECIALIST FIFTH CLASS CLARENCE EUGENE SASSER

(Mr. WEBER of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Specialist Fifth Class Clarence Eugene Sasser of the United States Army.

A native Texan, from Rosharon, Specialist Fifth Class Clarence Sasser was with the 9th Infantry Division and received his Medal of Honor for actions of immense gallantry on January 10, 1968, in Vietnam.

While his company was making an air assault, they were surrounded at the landing zone and suffered 30 casualties in the first few minutes. In order to assist the wounded, Specialist Fifth Class Sasser ran through open fire several times. He ignored his own need for medical attention in order to provide care to his fellow men. When both of his legs were immobilized, Sergeant First Class Sasser dragged himself into a position to assist others and then encouraged soldiers to crawl to safety where he tended to their wounds until evacuation.

It is for his upholding of the highest military values that I am proud to honor the actions of Specialist Fifth Class Clarence Eugene Sasser.

I'm RANDY WEBER, and that's the way it is in America.

HONORING PRIVATE FIRST CLASS ERNEST EDISON WEST

(Mr. MASSIE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Private First Class Ernest Edison West of the United States Army.

Private First Class West served with Company L, 25th Infantry Division and was awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry in action in Korea on October 12, 1952.

When Private First Class West's patrol was ambushed, he ordered his fellow men to withdraw while he braved enemy fire to reach and assist the patrol leader. In the evacuation process, he and his wounded leader came under intense enemy attack. Private First Class West used his body to shield the wounded officer and killed the attacking enemy. Although Private First Class West lost his eye and was seriously wounded, he returned again through intense fire to help evacuate more wounded soldiers.

Because of his valiant efforts and extraordinary military spirit, I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Private First Class Ernest Edison West of Kentucky's Fourth District.

HONORING SPECIALIST MICHAEL JOHN FITZMAURICE

(Mrs. NOEM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor a hero of our country and the State of South Dakota, Specialist Michael John Fitzmaurice, of the United States Army. Specialist Fitzmaurice, serving in the 3rd Platoon, Troop D, was awarded the Medal of Honor for his bravery in action on March 23, 1971, in Vietnam.

When three enemy explosive charges landed in their bunker, Specialist Fitzmaurice quickly removed two and smothered the other charge with his body and flak vest. Despite his injuries, he charged the enemy, engaging at times in hand-to-hand combat. Fitzmaurice refused medical evacuation and continued fighting.

It is because of his extraordinary bravery and devotion to duty that I am proud to honor the actions of Specialist Michael John Fitzmaurice today.

HONORING LIEUTENANT COLONEL CHARLES CHRIS HAGEMEISTER

(Ms. JENKINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Lieutenant Colonel Charles Chris Hagemeister of the United States Army.

Lieutenant Colonel Hagemeister was with the 1st Cavalry Division and was awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry in action on March 20, 1967, in Vietnam.

When Lieutenant Colonel Hagemeister's platoon came under attack, he disregarded his own safety and raced through deadly fire to provide aid to two of his wounded comrades. He then crawled forward to assist and encourage the platoon leader and other soldiers.

While under fire at close range, the lieutenant colonel took a rifle from a fallen soldier, killed a sniper, three advancing soldiers, and silenced an enemy machine gunner.

Unable to move the wounded, he again braved enemy fire and returned with help. Lieutenant Colonel Hagemeister then continued to administer aid and help remove his wounded brothers.

It is for his extraordinary bravery and selflessness that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Lieutenant Colonel Charles Chris Hagemeister.

HONORING PRIVATE FIRST CLASS ARTHUR J. JACKSON

(Mr. VALADAO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the valiant efforts of Private First Class Arthur J. Jackson of the United States Marine Corps.

Private First Class Arthur J. Jackson was awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity above and beyond the call of duty in action against the enemy in Japan.

When Private First Class Arthur J. Jackson's platoon's left flank advance was held up by the fire of Japanese troops, Private First Class Jackson charged a large pillbox housing approximately 35 enemy soldiers. Pouring his automatic fire into the opening of the fixed installation to trap the occupying troops, he hurled white phosphorous grenades and explosive charges demolishing the pillbox and killing the enemies. He advanced two smaller positions and stormed one gun position after another until he succeeded in wiping out a total of 12 pillboxes and 50 Japanese soldiers. His gallant initiative and heroic conduct in the face of extreme peril reflect the highest credit upon Private Jackson and the U.S. Naval Service.

It is for his courage and unwavering devotion to duty that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Private First Class Arthur J. Jackson.

HONORING PRIVATE FIRST CLASS DON J. JENKINS

(Mr. GUTHRIE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Medal of Honor recipient Don J. Jenkins of the United States Army for his brave service in Vietnam.

Under heavy crossfire, Don Jenkins maneuvered forward to an exposed position and began placing suppressive fire on the enemy. He exposed himself to extremely heavy fire when he repeatedly ran and crawled across open terrain to obtain resupplies of ammunition until he had exhausted all that was available for his machine gun. Displaying tremendous presence of mind, he then armed himself with two anti-tank weapons and, by himself, maneuvered through the rapid, hostile fire to within 20 meters of an enemy bunker to destroy that position. After moving back to the friendly defensive perimeter long enough to secure yet another weapon, a grenade launcher, Don Jenkins moved forward to a position providing no protection and resumed placing accurate fire on the enemy until his ammunition was again exhausted.

It is for his courage and unwavering devotion to duty that I am proud to honor the actions of Private First Class Don J. Jenkins of Morgantown, Kentucky. I have the great privilege of knowing him personally, and I'm proud to call him my friend.

HONORING MASTER SERGEANT RICHARD A. PITTMAN

(Mr. VEASEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Master Sergeant Richard Allan Pittman of the United States Marine Corps.

Master Sergeant Pittman was with Company I, 1st Division and was awarded the Medal of Honor for consummate gallantry in action on July 24, 1966, in Vietnam.

When the company fell under intense enemy fire, Master Sergeant Pittman grabbed a machine gun and rushed toward the front to provide support. Through withering enemy fire, Master Sergeant Pittman rushed to the front of the patrol and eliminated multiple enemy positions. Master Sergeant Pittman then charged an additional 50 yards to retrieve three downed marines. In establishing a defensive position, he was able to engage and inflict heavy casualties upon an enemy force of 40 and successfully ward off their advance, saving the lives of many of the company's men.

It is for his bold fighting spirit and extreme devotion to duty that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Master Sergeant Richard Allan Pittman.

HONORING SERGEANT ALLEN JAMES LYNCH

(Mr. HULTGREN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to honor a true American hero—Sergeant Allen James Lynch of Gurnee, Illinois.

Sergeant Lynch received the Medal of Honor for his brave actions in the Vietnam war where he risked his life to save three of his comrades.

On December 15, 1967, Lynch, serving as a radio-telephone operator for the United States Army, ran through open enemy fire to rescue three wounded soldiers. As the rest of the company withdrew, he stayed behind and single-handedly defended their position for 2 hours until reinforcements could be sent to evacuate them. Sergeant Lynch was just 22 years old at the time.

His meritorious actions extend far beyond his service in Vietnam. He continues to serve as a staunch advocate for disabled veterans and remains an inspiration to the community, often visiting with local schools and challenging students to be the next great leaders in America.

I commend his actions and his continued service to my community and to our country—a true inspiration.

I am proud to honor Sergeant Allen James Lynch and his outstanding courage.

HONORING MAJOR JAMES ALLEN TAYLOR

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Major James Allen Taylor of the United States Army. I have personally known Major Taylor in the north State for about a decade through personal involvement with veterans issues and events in the north State.

I also wish to extend my heartfelt thanks to my colleague, Representative JARED HUFFMAN, whose district Major Taylor actually resides in. Also, Major Taylor had been a constituent of mine for several years when I represented Trinity County.

Major Taylor was with the 1st Cavalry Regiment and awarded the Medal of Honor for gallantry in action on July 11, 1969, in Vietnam.

His men were engaged in an attack on a fortified position when a cavalry assault vehicle was hit and all five crew members were wounded. Major Taylor extracted the wounded despite heavy enemy fire. When a second vehicle was hit, Major Taylor moved forward again to rescue the wounded. While evacuating the wounded, Major Taylor engaged the enemy, killing several. At the evacuation point, a final vehicle was hit. Again, Major Taylor assisted in removing the wounded men and ensured that all wounded were safely evacuated.

I've met and known Major Taylor for several years, and it is my privilege to call him a friend.

It is through his selfless spirit and service to his crew that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Major James Allen Taylor.

HONORING LIEUTENANT MICHAEL EDWIN THORNTON

(Mr. BRADY of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Lieutenant Michael Edwin Thornton of the United States Navy in Montgomery, Texas.

Lieutenant Thornton was a senior adviser to Vietnamese Navy SEAL patrols and was awarded his Medal of Honor for extreme bravery in action on March 6, 1976, in Vietnam.

Lieutenant Thornton and his team snuck behind enemy lines. At sunup, the team made contact with an enemy force and engaged in a furious firefight with the enemy, inflicting many casualties before withdrawing. When some of the men were cut off from the team, Lieutenant Thornton went back in, through enemy fire, to find the wounded men and carry them to safety. In killing several enemy combatants and hauling the wounded out, Lieutenant Thornton saved the life of his superior officer.

It is for his heroic spirit in service to our Nation that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Lieutenant Michael Edwin Thornton.

HONORING SPECIALIST FOURTH CLASS GARY G. WETZEL

(Mr. WENSTRUP asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Specialist Fourth Class Gary George Wetzel of the United States Army.

Specialist Fourth Class Wetzel served in the 173rd Assault Helicopter Company and was awarded the Medal of Honor for his extreme heroism in action in Vietnam on January 8, 1968.

While going to the aid of his aircraft commander, Specialist Fourth Class Wetzel became critically wounded. Although his left arm was severed, Specialist Fourth Class Wetzel held his position and engaged the enemy. After eliminating three, he refused treatment and attempted to assist his aircraft commander. Due to the severity of his wounds, Specialist Fourth Class Wetzel lost consciousness. Once he regained consciousness, he persisted in his efforts to drag himself to the aid of his fellow crewman and assisted in bringing the commander to safety.

Because of his valiant efforts towards his fellow crewmen, I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Specialist Fourth Class Gary George Wetzel.

□ 1845

HONORING COLONEL JAMES FLEMING

(Mr. OLSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of a man from Manvel, Texas—an American hero, Colonel James Fleming of the United States Air Force.

Colonel Fleming was the pilot of a helicopter in the 20th Special Operations Squadron. He was awarded the Medal of Honor for gallantry in action on November 26, 1968, in Vietnam.

On that day, Colonel Fleming was ordered to rescue a six-man Special Forces patrol that was pinned down by enemy fighters. Already aware of one downed helicopter in the area, Colonel Fleming dropped his helicopter into the combat zone. Despite a failed first attempt and low fuel, Colonel Fleming did what every member of the U.S. military is trained to do—he left no man behind. He came back and hovered with an open cargo door while his helicopter was being raked by enemy fire. The six Green Berets jumped into his helicopter with the enemy 10 feet behind. Thanks to his heroic efforts, the six Green Berets made it out alive.

I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Colonel James Fleming.

HONORING COLONEL WALTER JOSEPH MARM, JR.

(Mr. HOLDING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of United States Army Colonel Walter Joseph Marm, Jr., of Fremont, North Carolina.

Colonel Marm demonstrated indomitable courage and was awarded the Medal of Honor during a combat operation in Vietnam.

As his company was moving to relieve a surrounded friendly unit, he realized that his platoon was receiving intense fire from a concealed machine gun. He deliberately exposed himself to draw its fire. Colonel Marm charged 30 meters across open ground and hurled grenades into the enemy position. Although severely wounded, Colonel Marm continued the momentum of his assault on the position, and he killed the remainder of the enemy, breaking the enemy assault.

It is for his gallantry on the battlefield and his extraordinary bravery at the risk of his life that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Colonel Walter Joseph Marm, Jr.

HONORING LIEUTENANT COLONEL HAROLD ARTHUR FRITZ

(Mr. SCHOCK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Lieutenant Colonel Harold Arthur Fritz, who served in the United States Army and is a resident of the 18th District of Illinois.

Lieutenant Colonel Fritz served in Vietnam with the 11th Armored Cavalry Regiment and was awarded the Medal of Honor for extraordinary gallantry in action on January 11, 1969.

While in Vietnam, Lieutenant Colonel Fritz' armored unit was ambushed, and his vehicle took a direct hit. Despite being seriously wounded himself, he fearlessly ran from vehicle to vehicle, positioning, providing aid and resupplying his men. The enemy attackers charged twice, but under Lieutenant Colonel Fritz' leadership, the unit stood its ground. Following the second charge, he led a brazen counteroffensive, forcing the oncoming enemy to withdraw. With the unit free from attack, he selflessly made sure that all of his men were cared for before allowing his own wounds to be treated.

So I am honored to stand and to recognize Lieutenant Colonel Harold Arthur Fritz for his undaunted courage, extraordinary bravery and fearless leadership.

HONORING SPECIALIST FOURTH CLASS PETER C. LEMON

(Mr. LAMBORN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the valiant efforts of Specialist Fourth Class Peter C. Lemon of the United States Army.

Specialist Fourth Class Peter C. Lemon was awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry above and beyond the call of duty in action against the enemy in Vietnam.

When the base came under heavy enemy attack, Sergeant Lemon engaged a numerically superior enemy with machine gun and rifle fire from his defensive position until both weapons malfunctioned. He then used hand grenades to fend off the intensified enemy attack launched in his direction. After eliminating all but one of the enemy soldiers in the immediate vicinity, he pursued and disposed of the remaining soldier in hand-to-hand combat. Lemon carried a more seriously wounded comrade to an aid station, and as he returned, was wounded a second time by enemy fire. Disregarding his personal injuries, he moved to his position through a hail of small arms and grenade fire. Sergeant Lemon immediately realized that the defensive sector was in danger of being overrun by the enemy, and he unhesitatingly assaulted the enemy soldiers by throwing hand grenades and engaging in hand-to-hand combat. He was wounded yet a third time, but his determined efforts successfully drove the enemy from the area.

It is for his courage and unwavering devotion to duty that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Specialist Fourth Class Peter C. Lemon.

HONORING COLONEL DONALD E. BALLARD

(Mr. YOHO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the valiant efforts of Colonel Donald Everett Ballard of the Kansas National Guard and formerly of the United States Navy.

Colonel Ballard, a Corpsman Second Class at the time, was with the 3rd Marine Division and was awarded the Medal of Honor for extreme fortitude and gallantry in action on May 16, 1968, in Vietnam.

Colonel Ballard's company was ambushed as they were evacuating a landing zone. Upon seeing wounded fellow marines, Colonel Ballard braved enemy fire to render medical assistance. As they prepared to move the wounded marines, an enemy soldier hurled a grenade that landed near the marines. After shouting a warning, Colonel Ballard threw himself upon the grenade to protect his fellow soldiers from the

blast. When the grenade failed to detonate, Colonel Ballard continued his treatment and saved countless marines.

It is for his courage and unwavering devotion to duty that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Colonel Donald Everett Ballard.

ROLL CALL OF HEROES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YOHO). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is again an honor for me to be here today with my colleagues to honor the 79 living Congressional Medal of Honor recipients.

To continue what we started earlier, I'd like to yield to my colleague from the great State of Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS).

HONORING CAPTAIN HOWARD V. LEE

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague and friend for the recognition and for the opportunity to recognize Captain Howard V. Lee from Virginia Beach, Virginia.

Captain Lee was awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry above and beyond the call of duty in action against the enemy in Vietnam.

When Lee realized that the unit had suffered numerous casualties, depriving it of effective leadership, and being fully aware that the platoon was even then under more heavy attack by the enemy, Major Lee took seven men and proceeded by helicopter to reinforce the beleaguered platoon. Major Lee disembarked from the helicopter with two of his men, and braving withering enemy fire, led them into the perimeter, where he fearlessly moved from position to position, directing and encouraging the overtaxed troops. Although painfully wounded by fragments from an enemy grenade in several areas of his body, including his eye, Major Lee continued undauntedly throughout the night to direct the valiant defense, coordinate supporting fire and apprising higher headquarters of the plight of the platoon. The next morning, he collapsed from his wounds and was forced to relinquish command.

It is for his courage and unwavering devotion to duty that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Captain Howard V. Lee. Semper Fi.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Thank you, my good friend Mr. SHIMKUS.

At this point, I would like to yield to my colleague from the 20th Congressional District of the great State of New York (Mr. TONKO).

HONORING SERGEANT FIRST CLASS FRANCIS SHERMAN CURREY

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois and the gentlewoman from Hawaii for bringing us together in a bipartisan, spirited way to recognize the living Medal of Honor winners, who are much applauded and much recognized and deeply loved by this Nation.

I rise this evening to honor the heroic efforts of Sergeant First Class Francis Sherman Currey of the United States Army.

Sergeant Currey served with the 30th Infantry Division and was awarded the Medal of Honor for acts of conspicuous gallantry on December 21, 1944, near Malmédy, Belgium.

While defending a strong point, Sergeant Currey's platoon was overrun by German tanks, leading to the withdrawal of his platoon. Sergeant Currey was able to obtain a bazooka despite taking heavy fire from enemy tanks and infantrymen just a short distance away. Pushing forward, Sergeant Currey eliminated one tank and cleared three German soldiers from a house. In discovering five trapped American soldiers, Sergeant Currey acquired several anti-tank grenades. In driving the tank men from their vehicles, he provided enough cover fire to free the five soldiers.

It is for his indomitable heroism and consummate devotion to duty that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Sergeant First Class Sherman Currey. I thank you for the opportunity to share with you this evening on behalf of this wonderful gentleman.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Thank you, sir. Thank you very much for being here to honor a true hero.

I would like to now yield to my colleague from Florida (Mr. BUCHANAN).

HONORING PRIVATE FIRST CLASS HECTOR ALBERT CAFFERATA, JR.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois and the gentlewoman from Hawaii.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Private First Class Hector Albert Cafferata, Jr., of the United States Marine Corps.

Private Cafferata was awarded the Medal of Honor for his bravery in action in Korea on November 28, 1950, while serving with the famed 1st Marine Division.

As the only unwounded member of his squad, he singlehandedly engaged the enemy while under heavy fire from machine guns, mortars and grenades. For over 7 hours, he was able to successfully fend off wave after wave of enemy attacks until reinforcements could arrive. However, as reinforcements moved in, an enemy grenade landed in his trench. The private immediately grabbed the grenade and threw it from the trench before it detonated. Though wounded by the blast,

he saved the lives of many of his men serving with him that day.

It is for his supreme bravery and courageousness in carrying out his duties that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Private First Class Hector Albert Cafferata, Jr.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Thank you to my colleague from Florida.

I would like to now yield to my colleague Mr. HECK from Washington's 10th Congressional District.

HONORING SERGEANT FIRST CLASS LEROY ARTHUR PETRY

Mr. HECK of Washington. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my expression of gratitude both to the gentleman from the State of Illinois and to the gentlelady from the State of Hawaii for the honor of participating in this.

I rise now to acknowledge the gallantry of a couple of more residents of Washington State's 10th Congressional District who are recipients of the Congressional Medal of Honor. I've had the great privilege of meeting both of these gentlemen.

First, I rise to honor the heroic efforts of Sergeant First Class Leroy Arthur Petry of the United States Army.

Sergeant First Class Petry was with the 75th Ranger Regiment and was awarded the Medal of Honor for exceptional bravery in action on May 26, 2008, in Afghanistan.

Though seriously wounded following an enemy attack, Sergeant First Class Petry was able to move himself and a companion to safety and communicate the situation to the rest of the squad. When another Ranger moved forward to assist them, a grenade fell between the men. Sergeant First Class Petry unhesitatingly sprang for it and attempted to throw it away. Although he saved the lives of the two men with him, the grenade exploded and seriously wounded Sergeant First Class Petry. Indeed, he lost a good part of his right arm, and his right hand is a prosthetic.

□ 1900

I've shaken that hand on multiple occasions, and I cannot explain the magic that it is among the warmest handshakes I've ever experienced.

It is for his extraordinary heroism and devotion to duty thought I'm proud to honor and remember the actions of Sergeant First Class Leroy Arthur Petry, a resident of Steilacoom, Washington.

HONORING MASTER SERGEANT WILBURN KIRBY ROSS

Mr. HECK of Washington. Finally, Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Master Sergeant Wilburn Kirby Ross of the United States Army.

Master Sergeant Ross was with the 3rd Infantry Division and was awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry in action on October 30, 1944, near Saint-Jacques, France.

After his company had attacked a German company, Master Sergeant

Ross placed his machine gun in front of their line in order to absorb the initial impact of a counterattack. Master Sergeant Ross then fired with deadly effect on the assaulting force and repelled it. He continued to man his machine gun, holding off six more German attacks. Master Sergeant Ross killed 40 and wounded 10 of the enemy, broke the assault single-handedly, and forced the Germans to withdraw. Master Sergeant Ross remained at his post that night and the following day for a total of 36 hours.

In a coda to his story, he was a careerist in the United States Army and was inadvertently shipped to Korea after World War II, which was against Department of Defense policy. Not discovered until he was halfway to Korea, his commanding officer asked him what he was doing there. He said, Well, I can hardly swim back now, sir. On the very first day in Korea, Sergeant Ross was wounded again, for which he received the Purple Heart.

It is for his extraordinary bravery that I'm proud to honor and remember the actions of Master Sergeant Wilburn Ross, a resident of Dupont, Washington.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to my good friend from the great State of New Jersey (Mr. LANCE).

HONORING COLONEL JACK H. JACOBS

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to honor the military service record of Colonel Jack H. Jacobs of Far Hills, New Jersey.

Colonel Jacobs was awarded the U.S. Army's Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry above and beyond the call of duty in action against the enemy in Vietnam.

Under intense heavy machine gun and mortar fire from a Viet Cong battalion, Colonel Jacobs called for and directed air strikes on the enemy positions to facilitate a renewed attack. Due to the intensity of the enemy fire and heavy casualties to the command group, including the company commander, the attack stopped.

Although wounded by mortar fragments, Colonel Jacobs assumed command of the allied company, ordered a withdrawal from the exposed position, and established a defensive perimeter. He returned under intense fire to evacuate a seriously wounded adviser to the safety of a wooded area where he administered lifesaving first aid. He then returned through heavy automatic weapons fire to evacuate the wounded company commander.

It is for his courage and unwavering devotion to duty that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Colonel Jack H. Jacobs.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Thank you, Mr. LANCE.

Mr. Speaker, since the first Medal of Honor was given on March 25, 1863, only 3,461 men have also earned it. Today, as has been mentioned, only 79 living recipients remain.

In order to properly honor these heroes, as you know, we've invited our

fellow Members of Congress in bipartisan fashion to come to the floor and speak on each one of the living recipients of this great Medal of Honor. But I'd first would like to personally thank my colleague, Congresswoman TULSI GABBARD, for joining me in this effort across the aisle. As a veteran and a current member of the Hawaii National Guard, Tulsi exemplifies the values and discipline of our armed services.

I would also like to recognize Garrett Anderson, my district staffer, who handles veteran issues and who was able to join me tonight for this special occasion. Garrett is a veteran of the Iraq war and has become a leader for all veterans and wounded warriors not only in his home community of Campaign-Urbana, but throughout our Nation.

Representative TULSI GABBARD and Garrett Anderson are not only role models to young folks across this great country, but to my own children as well. I'm honored to have their support tonight.

I now yield to my colleague, TULSI GABBARD.

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, I'm so proud personally to be able to join with my friend and colleague, Representative RODNEY DAVIS, as we lead this bipartisan Special Order to remember and to honor the extraordinary sacrifice and displays of true love of country that have been exemplified by the proud warriors who served in conflicts past and present.

President Kennedy once said:

A Nation reveals itself not only by the men it produces, but also by the men it honors and the men it remembers.

I had the privilege last year as the reunion was held in Hawaii for these remaining living Medal of Honor recipients. We had a dinner on the bow of the Mighty Mo at Pearl Harbor, and it was so incredible and moving to be there in the presence of people I had read about, been inspired by, and been motivated by as a child but also throughout my time training when those days felt dark and you felt tired and you felt like maybe I just can't do this. It was these men who truly exemplified and gave us, as we were training, energy to move forward.

Each of these 79 living veterans has been awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor, our Nation's highest military decoration for valor in combat. As we stand here this evening, we represent our constituents and the sentiments and appreciation of a grateful Nation.

HONORING STAFF SERGEANT ALLAN JAY KELLOGG, JR.

Ms. GABBARD. The select few, like Staff Sergeant Allan Jay Kellogg from my State of Hawaii, who also lives in my hometown of Kailua, consciously made the decision, at the point when it mattered most, to do an extraordinary thing: that if need be, they would give their lives for others. And what is so incredible about all of these men we have had the honor to meet is they are humble heroes who would do it in a heartbeat again if necessary.

They made tremendous sacrifices protecting our ideals and freedoms to keep our Nation safe. It's because of their sacrifice and their service that we can be here today to speak our minds—sometimes agreeing, sometimes disagreeing—where we can practice our faith, and pursue our dreams. That's the reason we gather today—Members of Congress from both parties and from across the country—to stand in awe of their sacrifice and to pay tribute to their heroic actions.

We also remember the parents and the community that raised these heroes, the families that stood behind them, the military that trained them, and their battle buddies, the men and women who served by their side.

I think I can safely say that I speak for all Americans when I say that we are incredibly grateful for what they have done for us and what they have done for our country. The courage they have shown, the example they have set for us is truly special. None of the words that we can say will ever be truly worthy of their sacrifice or their service, but we do our best to pay our tribute and express our gratitude.

HONORING SENATOR DANIEL K. INOUE

Ms. GABBARD. While tonight we're honoring the remaining living veterans who have been recipients of the Medal of Honor, I would like to take a moment to remember a Medal of Honor recipient who is near and dear to my heart, to the State of Hawaii, to the country, and who is no longer with us.

Senator Daniel K. Inouye enlisted in the U.S. Army at age 17 just after the attack on Pearl Harbor. He served with E Company of the 442 Regimental Combat Team, made up entirely of Americans of Japanese ancestry at a time when our country was putting Japanese Americans in concentration camps. In 1945, Senator Inouye lost his arm and suffered multiple injuries as he charged a series of German machine gun nests on a hill in Italy. His selfless acts during this battle later earned him the Medal of Honor. Continuing his lifelong commitment of service to Hawaii and the Nation, Danny Inouye was Hawaii's very first Congressman and served in the Senate since 1963. Senator Inouye was a true servant leader and an American hero of the highest order, and he continues to be an inspiration to me and countless others around the world.

Congressman DAVIS and I now have the honor to be joined by some of our colleagues as we continue to honor these courageous heroes.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Thank you, Tulsi. It is an honor to be standing here with you in this great Chamber to honor our heroes.

I now yield to my good friend from the great State of Washington (Mr. KILMER).

HONORING SERGEANT JOHN HAWK

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Representative DAVIS and Representative GABBARD for organizing this important time.

It's my honor to stand on the floor and recognize the heroic actions of two distinguished recipients of the Medal of Honor that I have the pleasure of representing, John Hawk and Bruce Crandall.

Sergeant Hawk was with the 90th Infantry Division and awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry while serving in France during World War II and particularly for his actions on August 20, 1944.

While manning a light machine gun, Sergeant Hawk successfully pushed back the infantry forces with his machine gun fire. When an artillery shell knocked out his gun and wounded his thigh, Sergeant Hawk secured a bazooka and pursued the remaining tanks, forcing them into a wooded section. While organizing two machine gun squads and facing intense enemy fire and with tanks in close proximity, Sergeant Hawk repeatedly climbed to an exposed knoll in order to direct fire until two of the tanks were knocked out and the third was driven off. Even while suffering a painful wound, Sergeant Hawk continued to direct fire until the enemy surrendered.

He showed that day, like many of our soldiers do, fearless initiative and heroic conduct.

HONORING LIEUTENANT COLONEL BRUCE PERRY CRANDALL

Mr. KILMER. That heroism was also displayed by Lieutenant Colonel Bruce Perry Crandall of the United States Army. Assigned to A Company, 229th Assault Helicopter Battalion, Lieutenant Colonel Crandall was awarded the Medal of Honor for his actions in Vietnam.

On November 14, 1965, then-Major Crandall led the first major division operation of air mobile troops into Landing Zone X-Ray, bringing ammunition and supplies and evacuating the wounded. Flying more than 14 hours in a single day in unarmed helicopters, Major Crandall and his team rescued more than 70 wounded soldiers. Under the most extreme fire, his brave decision to land under fire instilled in the other pilots the will to continue and ensured that the ground forces would be resupplied.

It's for his indomitable heroism I'm proud to honor and remember the actions of Lieutenant Colonel Bruce Crandall.

Let me just say in closing that our Nation is stronger for the service and sacrifices of these two distinguished Medal of Honor recipients, for all of the recipients of the Medal of Honor, and for all of those who serve our country.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Thank you.

Now I yield to my colleague from the great State of California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

HONORING SERGEANT MAJOR JON R. CAVAIANI

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the courageous acts of Sergeant Major Jon R. Cavaiani. Sergeant Major

Cavaiani earned his Medal of Honor during the war in Vietnam.

On the morning of June 4, 1971, Sergeant Major Cavaiani's camp came under intense enemy fire. Repeatedly exposing himself to that enemy fire in order to move about the perimeter, Cavaiani was able to direct the platoon's fire in a desperate fight for survival. When the platoon was called to be evacuated, Sergeant Major Cavaiani volunteered to remain on the ground and to direct the evacuation. The following morning, the enemy attack continued. Unable to slow down the assault, Sergeant Major Cavaiani ordered his platoon to escape while he stayed behind to provide cover fire, thus protecting the men of his platoon.

On behalf of a grateful Nation and a respectful and loving community, I'm proud to salute the heroism and recount the actions of Sergeant Major Jon R. Cavaiani of Columbia, California.

□ 1915

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Thank you, Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

Right now I would like to yield to my good friend from the great State of Indiana (Mr. MESSER).

HONORING SERGEANT SAMMY L. DAVIS

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the heroic efforts of a great Hero, Sergeant Sammy L. Davis of the United States Army. Sergeant Davis, then Private First Class Davis, distinguished himself while serving in a remote support base in Vietnam.

On November 18, 1967, Sergeant Davis' support base came under enemy mortar attack, and he was also threatened with a ground assault from across the river. Detecting a nearby enemy position, Sergeant Davis seized a machine gun and provided cover for his gun crew. But the enemy managed a direct hit. Ignoring warnings to seek cover, Sergeant Davis returned to the howitzer, which was burning furiously.

Although he was painfully injured by enemy mortar, Sergeant Davis relentlessly continued firing. Disregarding his injuries and his inability to swim, Sergeant Davis crossed the river on an air mattress, where he aided in returning three soldiers to the support base. Refusing medical attention for his own wounds, he joined another gun crew, firing at the enemy until they fled.

I am proud to honor and remember the extraordinary heroism of Sergeant Sammy L. Davis.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Thank you, Mr. MESSER.

I would like to now yield to my colleague from the great State of Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

HONORING CLARENCE EUGENE SASSER

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me thank my colleagues for allowing me to join you this evening in what I think is an enormously important tribute.

As I present this distinguished gentleman, this hero, I just want to make mention of my friend Clarence Eugene

Sasser, a Medal of Honor winner born September 12, 1947, who received his Medal of Honor for his actions in the Vietnam War. He's now passed, and I know that those who live recognize their fellow recipients for their heroism.

But we are honoring tonight those who live. And so it is my privilege to be able to salute Sergeant Major Kenneth E. Stumpf of Tomah, Wisconsin.

HONORING SERGEANT MAJOR KENNETH EDWARD STUMPF

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the heroic efforts of Sergeant Major Kenneth Edward Stumpf of the United States Army. Sergeant Major Stumpf was with Company C of the 25th Infantry Division and received the Medal of Honor for gallantry in action on April 25, 1967.

Might I just say, Mr. Speaker, we know that as our Vietnam vets came home, the response was not an American response. I'm grateful to be able to stand on the floor today to say that their valiant service evidenced by so many, and certainly through the honoring of this great Medal of Honor winner, now comes to the full attention of America where we will never, never welcome our soldiers home in any other manner than to say "thank you."

Sergeant Major Stumpf's company approached a village and encountered a well-fortified bunker complex. Three men were wounded in front of a hostile machine gun emplacement. Sergeant Major Stumpf and his squad successfully eliminated two bunker positions, but one still remained a serious threat.

Armed with hand grenades, Sergeant Major Stumpf ran through enemy fire, and as he reached the bunker, he pulled the pins on two grenades and directed them directly into it. With the bunkers eliminated, Sergeant Major Stumpf was able to rescue the three wounded servicemen.

It is for his fighting spirit and ultimate concern for the lives of his fellow soldiers that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Sergeant Major Kenneth Edward Stumpf. We will always remember the valiant efforts of our soldiers. Wars have agreement and disagreement, but no one, no one in America ever disagrees with the service, the sacrifice, the love, the valiant efforts of our men and women in the United States military.

Sergeant Major Kenneth Edward Stumpf, Medal of Honor winner, we salute you.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Thank you to the gentlelady from Texas.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to now be in the process where Ms. GABBARD and I are going to read some of the remaining speeches in honor of some of our heroes who are living today. And I would first like to go through a few for my colleagues that are going to be submitted for the RECORD but are unable to be here tonight due to extenuating circumstances.

HONORING SERGEANT FIRST CLASS GARY LEE LITRELL

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. My good friend BILL YOUNG from Florida submitted for the RECORD a speech in honor of Sergeant First Class Littrell of Florida. He was awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry above and beyond the call of duty in the Republic of Vietnam on April 8, 1970.

Sergeant First Class Littrell was assigned to the United States Military Assistance Command, and he distinguished himself while serving as a light weapons infantry adviser with the 23rd battalion.

HONORING COLONEL ROGER HUGH CHARLES DONLON

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. I would also like to submit for the RECORD in honor of my colleague LYNN JENKINS from the State of Kansas, to honor Colonel Roger Hugh Charles Donlon of Leavenworth, Kansas, who was awarded the Medal of Honor in 1964 for distinguished service in Vietnam. While defending a U.S. military installation against an attack by hostile forces, Colonel Donlon directed the defense operations in the midst of an enemy barrage.

HONORING MAJOR GENERAL PATRICK HENRY BRADY

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Also submitting for the RECORD on behalf of my colleague from Texas, LAMAR SMITH, we are going to honor Major General Patrick Henry Brady. Major General Brady was awarded the Medal of Honor for extreme heroism on January 6, 1968, in Vietnam as a member of the 54th Medical Detachment. He rescued dozens of seriously wounded men from an enemy-held territory blanketed by fog and braved enemy fire to save his comrades.

HONORING PETTY OFFICER ROBERT INGRAM

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Also, on behalf of my colleague ANDER CRENSHAW from the great State of Florida, I would like to honor Petty Officer Robert Ingram from Jacksonville, Florida, for the valiant efforts of Hospital Corpsman Third Class Robert Ingram, who was in the United States Navy and was awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity above and beyond the call of duty in the Republic of North Vietnam on March 28, 1966. He accompanied a point platoon as it engaged an outpost of a North Vietnamese battalion. As the fighting moved from a ridge to a rice paddy, the tree line exploded with a hail of bullets from 100 North Vietnamese regulars. In mere moments, the platoon ranks were decimated, but he proceeded to collect the ammunition from the dead and offered aid to the wounded.

I would also like to now yield to my colleague from the great State of Hawaii to honor some more of our heroes.

Ms. GABBARD. Thank you. Also, on behalf of two of my colleagues who unfortunately could not be here, I will honor their honorees.

HONORING FIRST LIEUTENANT BRIAN THACKER

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of CHRIS VAN HOLLEN from the State of Maryland, I would like to honor First Lieutenant Brian Thacker of the United States Army. He was with the 92nd Field Artillery Regiment and received his Medal of Honor for actions on March 31, 1971, in Vietnam.

When his base was attacked, he assisted in its defense and remained in position when it became apparent that the evacuation of the base was necessary. He organized and directed the withdrawal of the remaining friendly forces with complete disregard for his personal safety. Lieutenant Thacker remained inside the perimeter alone to provide covering fire until all friendly forces had escaped. Due to his selfless acts, he remained trapped behind enemy lines for 8 days before he was finally rescued.

HONORING CHIEF WARRANT OFFICER FOUR HERSHEL WOODROW WILLIAMS

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, also on behalf of my colleague Congressman RAHALL from West Virginia, I, with great pleasure, rise to honor Hershel Woodrow Williams and his heroic efforts and service.

I had the honor of meeting Hershel last year when he and the other Medal of Honor recipients were in Hawaii and heard directly from him. Even as he sat in a wheelchair, his courageous and bold spirit was alive and well. And it was such an honor to meet him, I asked him for his autograph.

He was with the Third Marine Division when he was awarded the Medal of Honor for gallantry on February 23, 1945, on the island of Iwo Jima. Flanked by just four riflemen, time and again Corporal Williams advanced into the enemy defenses to set charges and wipe out enemy positions with a flamethrower. He brazenly charged pillboxes and enemy defenses to pave the way for his fellow soldiers. Truly, his "unyielding determination and extraordinary heroism" are legendary.

But Woody's devotion did not end there. Back home, upon returning to his family, he served as a civilian counselor and as a volunteer in his church, community, and with veterans' organizations. He continued to dedicate his life to repay those who gave all so that he and countless others could come home, resulting in a lifelong commitment to service.

For his valiant devotion to our Nation, I'm so proud to honor Chief Warrant Officer Four Hershel Woodrow Williams.

HONORING PRIVATE FIRST CLASS THOMAS J. KINSMAN

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. I would like to now, Mr. Speaker, rise today to honor the valiant efforts of Private First Class Thomas J. Kinsman of the United States Army.

Private First Class Kinsman was awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity above and beyond the call of duty in action against the enemy in Vietnam.

As his company was proceeding up a narrow canal in armored troop carriers, it came under sudden and intense rocket attack, automatic weapons and small arms fire from a well-entrenched Vietcong force. The company immediately beached and began assaulting the enemy bunker complex. As they were moving through heavy enemy fire to effect a link-up, an enemy soldier in a concealed position hurled a grenade into their midst. Mr. Kinsman immediately alerted his comrades of the danger, then unhesitatingly threw himself on the grenade and blocked the explosion with his body. As a result of his courageous action, he received severe head and chest wounds.

Through his indomitable courage, complete disregard for his personal safety, and profound concern for his fellow soldiers, Private First Class Kinsman averted loss of life and injury to the other seven men of his element. It is for his courage and unwavering devotion to duty that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Private First Class Thomas J. Kinsman.

HONORING LIEUTENANT COLONEL JOE M. JACKSON

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, Lieutenant Colonel Joe M. Jackson was awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity above and beyond the call of duty in action against the enemy in Vietnam.

Colonel Jackson volunteered to attempt the rescue of a three-man U.S. Air Force combat control team from the Special Forces camp at Kham Duc. Hostile forces had overrun the forward outpost and established gun positions on the airstrip. The camp was engulfed in flames, and ammunition dumps were continuously exploding and littering the runway with debris. To further complicate his landing, the weather was deteriorating rapidly, thereby permitting only one airstrike prior to his landing.

Although fully aware of the extreme danger and likely failure of such an attempt, Lieutenant Colonel Jackson elected to land his aircraft and attempt the rescue. Displaying superb airmanship and extraordinary heroism, he landed his aircraft near the point where the combat control team was reported to be hiding. Once that team was onboard, Colonel Jackson succeeded in getting airborne despite the hostile fire.

It is for his courage and unwavering devotion to duty that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Lieutenant General Joe M. Jackson.

HONORING CHAPLAIN ANGELO J. LITEKY

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the valiant efforts of Chaplain Angelo J. Liteky of the United States Army. Chaplain Liteky was awarded the Medal of Honor.

Chaplain Liteky was participating in a search and destroy operation when Company A came under intense fire from a battalion-size enemy force. Observing two wounded men, Chaplain

Liteky moved to within 15 meters of an enemy machine gun position to reach them, placing himself between the enemy and the wounded men. Inspired by his courageous actions, the company rallied and began placing a heavy volume of fire upon the enemy's positions. In a magnificent display of courage and leadership, Chaplain Liteky began moving upright through the enemy fire, administering last rites to the dying and evacuating the wounded. Upon the unit's relief on the morning of December 7, 1967, it was discovered that, despite his painful wounds in the neck and foot, Chaplain Liteky had personally carried over 20 men to the landing zone for evacuation during the savage fighting. Through his indomitable inspiration and heroic actions, Chaplain Liteky saved the lives of a number of his comrades and enabled the company to repulse the enemy.

It is for his courage and unwavering devotion to duty that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Chaplain Liteky. And for reasons unbeknownst to many of us, Chaplain Liteky has renounced his Medal of Honor, but still on this floor of the House deserves to be honored for the heroism that he demonstrated that day in 1967.

HONORING MASTER SERGEANT NICHOLAS ORESKO

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, Master Sergeant Nicholas Oresko was a platoon leader with the Company C, 94th Infantry Division of the United States Army and was awarded the Medal of Honor for his action on January 23, 1945, in Germany.

While Company C was conducting an attack, it came under heavy enemy fire from its flanks, pinning the unit down. Master Sergeant Oresko swiftly moved forward alone, engaging the first bunker at point blank range and eliminating the enemy. Despite being wounded by grenade shrapnel, he pushed forward and managed to eliminate a second bunker with a grenade and clearing the remaining enemy with rifle fire.

□ 1930

Although severely wounded, Master Sergeant Oresko refused to leave the field until the mission was complete. It's for his quick thinking, indomitable courage, and devotion to duty in this attack that I'm proud to honor and remember the actions of Master Sergeant Nicholas Oresko.

HONORING SERGEANT EINAR H. INGMAN, JR.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to submit, for the RECORD, on behalf of my colleague from the great State of Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY), in honor of the valiant efforts of Sergeant Einar H. Ingman, Jr., of the United States Army.

Sergeant Ingman's company was pinned down by enemy fire that wounded all squad leaders and several other men. Then-Corporal Ingman assumed the command, reorganized and combined the two trapped squads, and proceeded to charge the enemy machine guns alone.

He took out one crew with a grenade before being hit by a second machine gun. Seriously injured, and with incredible courage and stamina, Corporal Ingman rose and killed the entire gun crew, using only his rifle, before falling unconscious from his wounds.

As a result of this singular action, the defense of the enemy was broken, his squad secured its objective, and more than 100 hostile troops abandoned their weapons and fled in disorganized retreat.

It is for his courage and unwavering devotion that I'm proud to honor, on behalf of my good friend and colleague from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY), and remember the actions of Sergeant Einar H. Ingman, Jr.

HONORING PRIVATE GEORGE TARO SAKATO

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, Private George Taro Sakato served with the 442nd Regimental Combat Team, the most highly decorated unit in the United States Army's history to this day. He was awarded the Medal of Honor for extreme gallantry on October 29, 1944, in France.

During a devastating assault by his platoon, Private Sakato killed five enemy soldiers and captured four. When his unit became pinned down by enemy fire, and without regard for that enemy fire surrounding him, Private Sakato charged forward and encouraged his squad to advance as well.

During the maneuver, Private Sakato's squad leader was killed. In taking charge, Private Sakato relentlessly pushed his men forward. Private Sakato and his unit were ultimately victorious in halting the enemy's attack. During this entire action, he managed to kill 12 enemy soldiers, while wounding two others.

It is for his gallant courage and fighting spirit that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Private George Taro Sakato.

HONORING LIEUTENANT THOMAS ROLLAND NORRIS

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Lieutenant Thomas Rolland Norris of Hayden Lake, Idaho, on behalf my colleague from Idaho (Mr. LABRADOR.)

Lieutenant Norris was a SEAL Advisor, and was awarded the Medal of Honor for supreme bravery in action from April 10 to April 13, 1972, in Vietnam.

During the 3-day period, Lieutenant Norris and a 5-man team established a Forward Operating Base deep within heavily-controlled enemy territory to conduct a rescue of several downed pilots. Although the first pilot was located and rescued on the evening of the first night, a second pilot was missing.

On the last day, Lieutenant Norris and one Vietnamese, dressed in fishermen disguises, traveled in a sampan up-river and located the last pilot. Lieutenant Norris and his companion were then able to safely return the pilot for medical care and evacuation.

It is for his outstanding display of leadership and courage that I am proud

to honor and remember the actions of Lieutenant Thomas Rolland Norris.

HONORING PRIVATE 1ST CLASS ROBERT ERNEST SIMANEK

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, Private 1st Class Robert Ernest Simanek was serving in Company F, 2nd Battalion, 5th Marines, 1st Marine Division, and received his Medal of Honor for his heroic actions in Korea on August 17, 1952.

When his unit came under attack by mortar and small arms fire, this private displayed an enormous level of commitment to his fellow troops by throwing himself on a grenade that was hurled in the midst of his unit. Although sustaining serious wounds, Private 1st Class Simanek's valiant action saved his fellow Marines from serious injury and death.

It is for his act of great personal valor and service to his country that I am so proud to honor the actions of Private 1st Class Robert Ernest Simanek.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to my friend and colleague from the great State of South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD).

HONORING MAJOR GENERAL JAMES EVERETT LIVINGSTON

Mr. SANFORD. I thank both of you for what you're doing tonight.

Mr. Speaker, as we well know, there are many heroes from across this country. Most recently we've seen them here in the Capitol with the tragedy of the Naval Yard. But I think that you all are doing something very special by recognizing military heroes in their different acts of heroism and courage over the years.

I'd like to single out a resident from my home State of South Carolina, Major General James Everett Livingston. And his story's an interesting one, as are so many of the stories that you've read.

But back on May 2 of 1968, he found himself as a young captain in the most unenviable of positions, in that a Marine company had been, basically, partitioned and was separated, and he and other men courageously went in to basically extract that Marine company.

In the process, he was hit twice by grenade shrapnel, but he, himself, declined medical help until they were able to go in, extract those Marines, and get them out.

I think it's in keeping with the military tradition of never leaving a man or a woman behind, and it says a lot about his personal courage, that he would, again, keep in the fight, even after withstanding personal injury, until those Marines were, again, up, out and extracted.

And so with that, I would simply like to single out his 33 years in the Marines, single out his wife, Sara, and his daughters, Melissa and Kimberly, for what they know, which is they have a hero for a dad and, indeed, a recipient of the Medal of Honor.

Thank you again for what you all are doing.

HONORING LIEUTENANT JOSEPH R. KERREY

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, Lieutenant Joseph Kerrey, of the United States Navy, was awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry in taking action against the enemy in Vietnam.

Kerrey led his SEAL team on a mission to capture important members of the enemy's area political cadre, known to be located on an island in the bay of Nha Trang.

Splitting his team into two elements, and coordinating both, Lieutenant Kerrey led his men in the treacherous downward descent to the enemy's camp. Just as they neared the end of their descent, intense enemy fire was directed at them, and Lieutenant Kerrey received massive injuries from a grenade which exploded at his feet and threw him backward onto the jagged rocks.

Utilizing his radioman, Lieutenant Kerrey called in the second element's fire support, which caught the confused Viet Cong in a devastating crossfire. Lieutenant Kerrey resolutely directed his men, despite his near unconscious state, until he was eventually evacuated by helicopter.

It is for his courage and unwavering devotion to duty that I am so proud to honor and remember the actions of Lieutenant Joseph R. Kerrey.

HONORING COLONEL BERNARD FRANCIS FISHER

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague from the great State of Idaho (Mr. LABRADOR), I rise to honor the heroic efforts of Colonel Bernard Francis Fisher of the United States Air Force and of Kuna, Idaho.

Colonel Fisher was with the 1st Air Commando Squadron, and was awarded the Medal of Honor for his conspicuous gallantry on March 10, 1966, in the Republic of Vietnam.

A Special Forces camp was under attack, and hostile troops had positioned themselves between the airstrip and the camp. Colonel Fisher observed a fellow airman crash on the airstrip. In the belief that the pilot was injured and in danger of capture, Colonel Fisher decided to land and attempt a rescue. Directing his own cover, he landed and taxied the full length of the runway to rescue the pilot.

Colonel Fisher's aircraft was struck 19 times. In the face of fire, he applied power and took off at the overrun airstrip.

It is for the risking of his life above the call of duty that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Colonel Bernard Francis Fisher.

HONORING LIEUTENANT THOMAS G. KELLEY

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, Lieutenant Thomas G. Kelley was awarded the Medal of Honor for his actions, and going above and beyond the call of duty, against the enemy in Vietnam.

Lieutenant Kelley was in charge of a column of eight river assault aircrafts which were extracting one company of U.S. Army infantry troops on the east bank of the Ong Muong Canal in Kien

Hoa province when one of the armored troop carriers reported a mechanical failure of a loading ramp.

At approximately the same time, Viet Cong forces opened fire from the opposite bank of the canal. After issuing orders for the crippled troop carrier to raise its ramp manually and for the remaining boats to form a protective cordon around the disabled craft, Lieutenant Commander Kelley, realizing the extreme danger to his column and its inability to clear the ambush site until the crippled unit was repaired, boldly maneuvered the monitor in which he was embarked to the exposed side of the protective cordon, in direct line with the enemy's fire, and he ordered the monitor to commence firing.

Sustaining serious head wounds from the blast which hurled him to the deck of the monitor, Lieutenant Commander Kelley disregarded his severe injuries and attempted to continue directing the other boats.

It is for his courage and unwavering devotion to duty that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Lieutenant Thomas G. Kelley.

HONORING MASTER SERGEANT RONALD E. ROSSER

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of my colleague from Ohio (Mr. STIVERS) to honor the heroic efforts of Master Sergeant Ronald Eugene Rosser of the United States Army.

Master Sergeant Rosser was serving with the 2nd Infantry Division and received his Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry in action on January 12, 1952, in Korea.

When Master Sergeant Rosser's platoon came under heavy enemy fire from two sides, he charged the enemy's positions, taking the hill, and killing seven. Master Sergeant Rosser then descended to rearm and retake the hill once more, while eliminating enemies along the way.

After he had taken the hill a third time, and killed at least 13, Master Sergeant Rosser helped retrieve the wounded men and make a successful withdrawal.

It is for his gallant actions and courageous and selfless devotion to duty that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Master Sergeant Ronald Eugene Prosser.

HONORING CORPORAL TIBOR RUBIN AND 2ND LIEUTENANT WALTER DAVID EHLERS

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, it is on behalf of my colleague from California, ALAN LOWENTHAL, that I am proud to honor two of his constituents who've been recipients of this prestigious Medal of Honor.

The first is Corporal Tibor Rubin, who served in the United States Army with the 1st Cavalry Division and received his Medal of Honor for his actions on July 23, 1950, to April 20, 1953, in Korea.

While the regiment was withdrawing, Corporal Rubin singlehandedly held off

enemy charges, allowing the 8th Cavalry to complete its withdrawal. On October 30, a number of Chinese forces mounted an assault on Corporal Rubin's unit. He maintained his firing position until he had exhausted all of his ammunition.

Although inflicting heavy casualties on the enemy, Corporal Rubin was eventually captured. While in prison camp however, the Corporal continued his resistance and selflessness by caring for his sick comrades.

Also from Congressman LOWENTHAL's district is one of our heroes, 2nd Lieutenant Walter David Ehlers. He served with the 1st Infantry Division of the United States Army and was awarded the Medal of Honor for his service in France.

Second Lieutenant Ehlers was part of the second wave on D-day. When the first wave became pinned down, his unit was sent forward to assist. On June 9, he led his unit's attack against German forces and defeated several enemy machine gun nests.

The very next day his platoon came under heavy fire, and he singlehandedly diverted enemy fire so his fellow servicemen could withdraw. Despite being wounded, 2nd Lieutenant Ehlers carried another wounded rifleman to safety. Even after he was treated, he refused to be evacuated so that he could return to leading his squad.

It's for his display of indomitable courage that I'm so proud to honor and remember the actions of 2nd Lieutenant Walter David Ehlers.

HONORING TECHNICIAN 5TH GRADE ROBERT D. MAXWELL

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of my colleague from the great state of Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) to honor Technician 5th Grade Robert Dale Maxwell of the United States Army.

Technician 5th Grade Maxwell was in the 3rd Infantry Division and was awarded the Medal of Honor for supreme bravery in action on September 7, 1944, in France.

Technician 5th Grade Maxwell and three others, armed only with .45 caliber sidearms, defended the battalion headquarters against an overwhelming onslaught by an enemy platoon. Despite withering enemy fire, Maxwell aggressively fought off the advancing enemy and inspired his fellow soldiers to continue. When an enemy hand grenade landed among the squad, Mr. Maxwell unhesitatingly hurled himself upon it, using his blanket and body to absorb the full force of the explosion. The act of incredible heroism permanently maimed Technician 5th Grade Maxwell but saved the lives of his comrades and enabled vital communications to continue during the withdrawal from the headquarters.

It is for his valiant efforts and relentless spirit that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Technician 5th Grade Robert Dale Maxwell.

HONORING CAPTAIN THOMAS J. HUDNER, JR.

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, Captain Thomas Jerome Hudner, Jr., served

with the United States Navy's Fighter Squadron 32 and was awarded the Medal of Honor for his brave actions on December 4, 1950, in the air over Korea.

When Captain Hudner's wingman was shot from the air and crash-landed behind enemy lines, he courageously circled his comrade and attempted to fight off enemy advancing on his wingman's position. Upon noticing that his wingman was stuck in his burning plane, Captain Hudner crash-landed his own plane into the rough mountains and in close proximity to the enemy's position in an attempt to save his buddy. Captain Hudner ran to his wingman's position and attempted to free him from the burning wreckage. Unable to free him, Captain Hudner returned to his aircraft to call in a rescue helicopter and support personnel.

It is for his exceptionally valiant actions that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Captain Thomas Jerome Hudner, Jr.

□ 1945

HONORING SERGEANT GARY BURNELL BEIKIRCH

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the bravery and courage of Sergeant Gary Burnell Beikirch of the United States Army.

Sergeant Beikirch was with the 1st Special Forces and was awarded the Medal of Honor for extreme gallantry in action on April 1, 1970, in Vietnam. When an enemy force launched an attack, the allied defenders suffered a multitude of casualties. Without regard for his own well-being, Sergeant Beikirch sprinted from position to position to treat the wounded servicemen. Upon receiving notice that an American officer had been wounded and left exposed, Sergeant Beikirch charged through enemy fire and carried the officer to safety. Instead of allowing for his own wounds to be treated, Sergeant Beikirch continuously ran between the aid station and the field of battle to retrieve the wounded.

It is for his complete and utter devotion to the welfare of his fellow soldiers that I'm proud to honor the actions tonight of Sergeant Gary Burnell Beikirch.

HONORING LIEUTENANT GENERAL ROBERT FRANKLIN FOLEY

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, Lieutenant General Robert Franklin Foley served in the United States Army, where he received the Medal of Honor for leading his unit, Company A, 2nd Battalion, 27th Infantry 25th Division, on November 5, 1966, in the Republic of Vietnam. While moving to aid a besieged unit, Lieutenant General Foley's company clashed with a strong enemy defense post. Lieutenant General Foley, directing three platoons, was able to attend to the wounded soldiers while advancing them. Coming under intense fire, the Lieutenant General, alone, continued to advance until the wounded had been evacuated. Then, after being struck by a grenade himself, Lieutenant General Foley refused

medical aid and led an assault to destroy three enemy positions.

It is for his outstanding leadership and selflessness that I'm so proud to honor and remember the actions of Lieutenant General Robert Franklin Foley.

HONORING COLONEL HARVEY CURTISS BARNUM, JR.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the supreme heroism of Colonel Harvey Curtiss Barnum, Jr., of the United States Marine Corps. Colonel Barnum was with the 3rd Marine Division and was awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry in action on December 18, 1965, in Vietnam.

Colonel Barnum's company became pinned down by enemy fire. Upon discovering the company commander and radio operator were seriously wounded, he took control of the radio and assumed command of the rifle company. Colonel Barnum began positioning the men into firing positions and began identifying targets to engage. Behind his leadership, the units maintained their composure in the face of extreme danger and potential disadvantage. Colonel Barnum took point and led the platoon on a successful counterattack, eliminating key positions, and evacuated the wounded.

It is for his extraordinary courage that I'm proud to stand here to honor and remember the actions of Colonel Harvey Curtiss Barnum, Jr.

HONORING COLONEL GORDON RAY ROBERTS

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, Colonel Gordon Ray Roberts was a rifleman in the 101st Airborne Division and awarded the Medal of Honor for his service on July 11, 1969, in Vietnam.

Colonel Roberts' platoon was sent to provide assistance to a sister company. When his platoon became pinned down by heavy gun and grenade fire, Colonel Roberts, with utter disregard for his own well-being, charged forward beyond the perimeter and safety of his unit. Without fear or concern, Colonel Roberts eliminated four enemy positions and linked up with the imperiled company. He assisted with evacuating the wounded and supervised the withdrawal from the position before returning to his own unit.

It is for his gallant and selfless actions contributing directly to saving the lives of his fellow soldiers that I'm proud to honor and remember the actions of Colonel Gordon Ray Roberts.

HONORING LIEUTENANT JOHN JAMES MCGINTY, III

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Lieutenant John James McGinty, III, of the United States Marine Corps, who is from Beaufort, South Carolina. He was with Company K and was awarded the Medal of Honor for gallantry in action on July 18, 1966, in Vietnam.

While providing rear security to guard the withdrawal of the battalion, Lieutenant McGinty's 32-man platoon came under heavy fire. During the barrage, two of McGinty's squads became

separated. Disregarding his own safety, McGinty ran through automatic weapons and mortar fire to convene with the separated squads. Upon arriving, he found 20 men wounded and the medical corpsman killed. He quickly reloaded ammunition for the wounded men and, though wounded, continued to encourage his troops and direct their fire. Through multiple close encounters, Lieutenant McGinty was able to adjust artillery and effectively fight off the enemy.

It is for his indomitable heroism and devotion to duty that I'm proud to honor and remember the actions of Lieutenant John James McGinty, III.

Mr. Speaker, I want to yield to Ms. GABBARD for some closing comments.

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, it has truly been a privilege and a high note of my service as a Member of Congress to be able to stand here with my friend and colleague, Congressman DAVIS, to be able to read the highlights of the courageous actions of heroes whose service has allowed us to be here today. This is a moment that I will never forget—a moment that I look forward to sharing with many of my battle buddies, my servicemembers back home.

It's a time for us to reflect. As we've heard through reading through these courageous actions, it's like reading through a storybook. These are the actions of heroes and legends that maybe we imagined as children. But we know that these are living heroes who not only put their lives on the line in the service of our country overseas, but have come home and continued that service. They have only accepted this Medal of Honor in a humble way, and we honor those who did not make it home.

I look forward to us in our work here in Congress to be able to live up to the standard that they have set and to honor their service and sacrifice as we do our best working in the people's House to serve our country.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this would not happen without great people helping to put this information together to honor these true heroes. I want to thank some folks who have worked with me: Nick Cozzo, Jordan Wellinghoff, Cathryn Ayers, Shontee Pant, Jenny Baldwin, Drew Collins, Frank Santana, and Osborne Crosby, among many others that I'm sure I'm going to forget to mention tonight.

Remember, this is an honor tonight. We are not Republicans. We are not Democrats. We are Americans coming together to honor in a bipartisan fashion 79 individuals who fought to protect the freedoms that we enjoy and to be able to stand here on this House floor in freedom and to be Americans and to govern.

It is with great pride that I was able to be joined tonight by my colleague, my friend, TULSI GABBARD, also a member of our military today. Thank you for your service, TULSI. Thank you for your service to your country here and

your service as a member of the Hawaii National Guard.

It is with great privilege that I was honored to stand here tonight to recognize so many true American heroes. And it's a privilege that I will never forget throughout my career.

I yield back the balance of my time.

HONORING COLONEL BERNARD F. FISHER

Mr. LABRADOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Colonel Bernard Francis Fisher of the United States Air Force.

Colonel Fisher was with the 1st Air Commando Squadron and was awarded the Medal of Honor for his conspicuous gallantry on March 10, 1966 in the Republic of Vietnam.

A Special Forces camp was under attack and hostile troops had positioned themselves between the airstrip and the camp. Colonel Fisher observed a fellow airman crash on the airstrip. In the belief that the pilot was injured and in danger of capture, Colonel Fisher decided to land and attempt a rescue. Directing his own cover, he landed and taxied the full length of the runway to rescue the pilot. Colonel Fisher's aircraft was struck 19 times. In the face of fire, he applied power and took off at the overrun airstrip.

It is for the risking his life above the call of duty that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Colonel Bernard Francis Fisher.

HONORING LIEUTENANT THOMAS R. NORRIS

Mr. LABRADOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Lieutenant Thomas Rolland Norris of the United States Navy.

Lieutenant Norris was a SEAL Advisor and was awarded the Medal of Honor for supreme bravery in action from April 10 to April 13, 1972 in Vietnam.

During the three-day period, Lieutenant Norris and a 5-man team established a Forward Operating Base ("FOB") deep within heavily controlled enemy territory to conduct a rescue of several downed pilots. Although the first pilot was located and rescued on the evening of the first night, a second pilot was still missing. On the last day, Lieutenant Norris and one Vietnamese, dressed in fishermen disguises, travelled in a sampan up-river and located the last pilot. Lieutenant Norris and his companion were then able to safely return the pilot for medical care and evacuation.

It is for his outstanding display of leadership and courage that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Lieutenant Thomas Rolland Norris.

HONORING FIRST LIEUTENANT BRIAN THACKER

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of First Lieutenant Brian Thacker of the United States Army.

First Lieutenant Thacker was with the 92nd Field Artillery Regiment and received his Medal of Honor for actions of great gallantry on March 31, 1971 in Vietnam.

When First Lieutenant Thacker's base was attacked he assisted in its defense and remained in position when it became apparent that evacuation of the base was necessary. He organized and directed the withdrawal of the remaining friendly forces with complete disregard for his personal safety. First Lieutenant Thacker remained inside the perimeter alone to provide covering fire until all friendly forces had escaped. Due to his selfless acts, First Lieutenant Thacker remained trapped behind enemy lines for eight days before he was finally rescued.

It is for his valiant efforts and selfless spirit in service to our nation that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of First Lieutenant Brian Thacker.

HONORING CORPORAL TIBOR RUBIN

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Corporal Tibor Rubin of the United States Army.

Corporal Rubin was with the 1st Cavalry Division and received his Medal of Honor for extraordinary heroism in action from July 23, 1950 to April 20, 1953 in Korea.

While the Regiment was withdrawing, Corporal Rubin single-handedly held off enemy charges allowing the 8th Cavalry to complete its withdrawal. On October 30, 1950, a number of Chinese forces mounted an assault on Corporal Rubin's unit. Corporal Rubin maintained his firing position until he had exhausted all his ammunition. Although inflicting heavy casualties on the enemy, Corporal Rubin was eventually captured. While in a prison camp, however, the Corporal continued his resistance and selflessness by caring for his sick comrades.

It is for his unyielding courage and bravery that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Corporal Tibor "Ted" Rubin.

HONORING TECHNICIAN FIFTH GRADE ROBERT D. MAXWELL

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Technician Fifth Grade Robert Dale Maxwell of the United States Army.

Technician 5th Grade Maxwell was in 3rd Infantry Division and was awarded the Medal of Honor for supreme bravery in action on September 7, 1944 near Besancon, France.

Technician 5th Grade Maxwell and 3 others, armed only with .45 caliber side arms, defended the battalion headquarters against an overwhelming onslaught by an enemy platoon. Despite withering enemy fire Maxwell aggressively fought off the advancing enemy and inspired his fellow soldiers to continue. When an enemy hand grenade landed among the squad, Technician 5th Grade Maxwell unhesitatingly hurled himself upon it, using his blanket and body to absorb the full force of the explosion. The act of incredible heroism permanently maimed Technician 5th Grade Maxwell, but saved the lives of his comrades and enabled vital communications to continue during the withdrawal from the headquarters.

It is for his valiant efforts and relentless spirit that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Technician Fifth Grade Robert Dale Maxwell.

HONORING SERGEANT FIRST CLASS GARY LEE LITTELL

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Congressional Medal of Honor Society, comprised solely of Medal of Honor recipients. During this week, the recipients will assemble to honor and remember all who have served our country and to further the brotherhood among one another. This year, Gettysburg, Pennsylvania has been chosen as the site for the convention and Sergeant First Class Littrell of the United States Army and his valiant efforts will be recognized and he will be the featured hero of this year's convention.

Sergeant First Class Littrell was awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity above and beyond the call of duty in Kontum province, Republic of Vietnam, on 4–8 April 1970. Sergeant First Class Littrell was assigned to the United States Military Assistance Command, Vietnam, and Advisory

Team 21. He distinguished himself while serving as a Light Weapons Infantry Advisor with the 23d Battalion, 2d Ranger Group, Republic of Vietnam Army, near Dak Seang. After establishing a defensive perimeter on a hill on April 4, the battalion he was assigned was subjected to an intense enemy mortar attack which killed the Vietnamese commander, one advisor, and seriously wounded all the advisors except Sergeant First Class Littrell. During the ensuing four days, Sergeant First Class Littrell exhibited near superhuman endurance as he single-handedly bolstered the besieged battalion. Repeatedly abandoning positions of relative safety, he directed artillery and air support by day and marked the unit's location by night, despite the heavy, concentrated enemy fire. His dauntless will instilled in the men of the 23rd Battalion a deep desire to resist. Assault after assault was repulsed as the battalion responded to the extraordinary leadership and personal example exhibited by Sergeant First Class Littrell as he continuously moved to those points most seriously threatened by the enemy, redistributed ammunition, strengthened faltering defenses, cared for the wounded and shouted encouragement to the Vietnamese in their own language. When the beleaguered battalion was finally ordered to withdraw, numerous ambushes were encountered. Sergeant First Class Littrell repeatedly prevented widespread disorder by directing air strikes to within 50 meters of their position. Through his indomitable courage and complete disregard for his safety, he averted excessive loss of life and injury to the members of the battalion. The sustained extraordinary courage and selflessness displayed by Sergeant First Class Littrell over an extended period of time were in keeping with the highest traditions of the military service and reflect great credit on him and the U.S. Army. It is for his courage and unwavering devotion to duty that I am proud to honor and remind our fellow Americans of the actions of Sergeant First Class Littrell.

HONORING SECOND LIEUTENANT WALTER D. EHLERS

Mr. LOWNETHAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Second Lieutenant Walter David Ehlers of the United States Army.

Second Lieutenant Ehlers was with the 1st Infantry Division and was awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry in action near Goville, France.

Second Lieutenant Ehlers was of part of the second wave on D-Day. When the first wave became pinned down, his unit was sent forward to assist. On June 9th he led his unit's attack against German forces and defeated several enemy machinegun nests. The next day, his platoon came under heavy fire and he singlehandedly diverted enemy fire so his fellow servicemen could withdraw. Despite being wounded, Second Lieutenant Ehlers carried another wounded rifleman to safety. After treatment, he refused to be evacuated and returned to leading his squad.

It is for his display of indomitable courage that I am proud to honor and remember the action of Second Lieutenant Walter David Ehlers.

HONORING CHIEF WARRANT OFFICER FOUR
HERSHEL WOODROW WILLIAMS

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Hershel Woodrow Williams and his heroic efforts and continued selfless service to his fellow veterans.

Corporal Williams was with the 3rd Marine Division when he was awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry in action on February 23, 1945, on the island of Iwo Jima. Flanked by only four riflemen, time and again, Corporal Williams advanced into the enemy defenses to set charges and wipe out enemy positions with a flamethrower. He brazenly charged pillboxes and enemy defenses to pave the way for his fellow soldiers. His "unyielding determination and extraordinary heroism" are legendary.

But Woody's devotion nor did he feel his duty ended there. Back home he served as a civilian counselor and as a volunteer in his church, community and with veterans' organizations. A lifetime dedicated to repay those who gave all so that he and countless others could come home; a lifelong commitment to assisting veterans, their spouses and children.

For all his valiant devotion to our Nation, I am proud to honor Chief Warrant Officer Four, Hershel Woodrow Williams.

HONORING SERGEANT EINAR H. INGMAN, JR.

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the valiant efforts of Sergeant Einar H. Ingman, Jr. of the United States Army.

Sergeant Einar H. Ingman, Jr. was awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity above and beyond the call of duty in action against the enemy in Korea.

Members of Sergeant Ingman's company were pinned down by pinned down enemy fire that wounded all squad leaders and several other men. Then Cpl. Ingman assumed command, reorganized and combined the two trapped squads, and proceeded to charge the enemy machine guns alone. He took out one crew with a grenade before being hit by a second machine gun. Seriously injured, and with incredible courage and stamina, Cpl. Ingman rose and killed the entire gun crew using only his rifle before falling unconscious from his wounds. As a result of this singular action, the defense of the enemy was broken, his squad secured its objective, and more than 100 hostile troops abandoned their weapons and fled in disorganized retreat.

It is for his courage and unwavering devotion to duty that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Sergeant Einar H. Ingman, Jr.

HONORING MAJOR GENERAL PATRICK HENRY
BRADY

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today we honor Major General Patrick Henry Brady of the United States Army.

Major General Brady was awarded the Medal of Honor for extreme heroism on January 6, 1968, in the Republic of Vietnam as a member of the 54th Medical Detachment.

Major General Brady rescued dozens of seriously wounded men from an enemy-held territory blanketed by fog. He braved heavy enemy fire and risked his own life to save the lives of them. By the end of the day, Major General Brady had employed three different aircraft to evacuate 51 wounded men, most of whom would otherwise have perished.

It is for his unwavering courage that we are proud to honor and appreciate the actions of Major General Patrick Henry Brady, who lives in New Braunfels, Texas.

HONORING COLONEL ROGER HUGH CHARLES
DONLON

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Colonel Roger Hugh Charles Donlon of the United States Army.

Colonel Donlon was with Army Special Forces Detachment A-726 and awarded the Medal of Honor for supreme gallantry in action on July 1964, in Vietnam.

While defending a U.S. military installation against an attack by hostile forces, Colonel Donlon directed the defense operations in the midst of an enemy barrage.

He marshaled his forces and ordered the removal of needed ammunition from a blazing building. He then dashed through small arms fire, detected the enemy and quickly dispatched them.

Colonel Donlon sustained a severe stomach wound and disregarded his own injury for the wellbeing of his men.

As daylight brought defeat to the enemy, Colonel Donlon reorganized his defenses and administered first aid to the wounded.

It is for his extreme display of bravery that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Colonel Roger Hugh Charles Donlon.

HONORING PETTY OFFICER ROBERT R. INGRAM

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the valiant efforts of Hospital Corpsman Third Class Robert R. Ingram of the United States Navy.

Petty Officer Ingram was awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity above and beyond the call of duty in Republic of North Vietnam on 28 March 1966.

Petty Officer Ingram accompanied a point platoon as it engaged an outpost of a North Vietnamese battalion. As the fighting moved from a ridge to a rice paddy, the tree line exploded with a hail of bullets from 100 North Vietnamese regulars.

In mere moments, the platoon ranks were decimated. Oblivious to the dangers, Petty Officer Ingram crawled across the bullet-splattered terrain to reach a downed Marine.

Ingram was injured, but he proceeded to collect ammunition from the dead and offered aid to the wounded.

From 4 pm until just prior to sunset, Petty Officer Ingram pushed, pulled, cajoled, and doctored his Marines. Despite pain and the probability of his own death, Petty Officer Ingram's actions, initiative and dedication to duty saved many lives.

In 2001, I was honored to be able to dedicate the Medical clinic at our local Navy base in honor of his courage and unwavering devotion to duty.

In Jacksonville, he continues his work as a nurse and is considered a local hero. I am proud to recognize the bravery and heroism of Petty Officer Ingram.

HONORING MASTER SERGEANT RONALD E.
ROSSER

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Master Sergeant Ronald Eugene Rosser of the United States Army.

Master Sergeant Rosser was serving with the 2nd Infantry Division and received his Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry in action on January 12, 1952 in Korea.

When Master Sergeant Rosser's platoon came under heavy enemy fire from two sides, he charged the enemy's positions, taking the hill, and killing 7. Master Sergeant Rosser then descended to rearm and retake the hill once more while eliminating enemies along the way. After he had taken the hill a third time and killed at least 13, Master Sergeant Rosser helped retrieve the wounded men and make a successful withdrawal.

It is for his gallant actions and courageous and selfless devotion to duty that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Master Sergeant Ronald Eugene Rosser.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO PERSONS WHO COMMIT, THREATEN TO COMMIT, OR SUPPORT TERRORISM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 113-63)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism declared in Executive Order 13224 of September 23, 2001, is to continue in effect beyond September 23, 2013.

The crisis constituted by the grave acts of terrorism and threats of terrorism committed by foreign terrorists, including the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, in New York and Pennsylvania and against the Pentagon, and the continuing and immediate threat of further attacks on United States nationals or the United States that led to the declaration of a national emergency on September 23, 2001, has not been resolved. These actions continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. For this reason, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13224 with respect to persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 18, 2013.

AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE PARTIES TO THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY FOR COOPERATION REGARDING ATOMIC INFORMATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 113-64)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit to the Congress, consistent with sections 123 and 144 b. of the Atomic Energy Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2153 and 2164(b)), the text of the Agreement Between the Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty for Cooperation Regarding Atomic Information, including a technical annex and security annex (hereinafter collectively referred to as the "ATOMAL Agreement"), as a proposed agreement for cooperation authorizing the exchange of U.S. Restricted Data and Formerly Restricted Data within the context of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) between the United States of America and the following member of NATO: the Republic of Croatia (hereinafter the "New Party").

In addition, I am pleased to transmit my written approval, authorization, and determination concerning the ATOMAL Agreement with respect to the New Party, with a copy of the memorandum of the Secretary of Defense with respect to the agreement. The ATOMAL Agreement entered into force on March 12, 1965, with respect to the United States and the other NATO members at that time. The Czech Republic, the Republic of Hungary, the Republic of Poland, Spain, the Republic of Bulgaria, the Republic of Estonia, the Republic of Latvia, the Republic of Lithuania, Romania, the Slovak Republic, and the Republic of Slovenia subsequently became parties to the ATOMAL Agreement. The New Party has signed this agreement and has indicated its willingness to be bound by it. The ATOMAL Agreement with respect to the New Party meets the requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended. Although the ATOMAL Agreement continues in force with respect to the United States and the other current parties to it, it will not become effective as an agreement for cooperation authorizing the exchange of atomic information with respect to the New Party until completion of procedures prescribed by sections 123 and 144 b. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended.

For more than 40 years, the ATOMAL Agreement has served as the framework within which NATO and the other NATO members that have become parties to this agreement have received the information that is necessary to an understanding and knowledge of, and participation in, the political and strategic consensus upon which the collective military capacity of the Alliance depends. This agreement permits only the transfer of atomic information, not weapons, nuclear material, or equipment. Participation in the ATOMAL Agreement will give the New Party the same standing within the Alliance with regard to nuclear matters as that of the other current parties to the ATOMAL Agreement. This is important for the cohesiveness of the Alliance and will enhance its effectiveness.

I have considered the views and recommendations of the Department of Defense (DOD) and other interested agencies in reviewing the ATOMAL

Agreement and have determined that its performance, including the proposed cooperation and the proposed communication of Restricted Data thereunder with respect to the New Party, will promote, and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to, the common defense and security. Accordingly, I have approved the ATOMAL Agreement with respect to the New Party and authorized the DOD to cooperate with the New Party in the context of NATO upon satisfaction of the requirements of section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended.

The 60-day continuous session period provided for in section 123 begins upon receipt of this submission.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 18, 2013.

COMPREHENSIVE IMMIGRATION REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from California (Mr. CÁRDENAS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor to be here on the floor to speak to America and those around the world who watch and understand all that we try to do in this Congress. It gives me great pleasure and honor to speak tonight about a very important issue that faces America but is just as important to people from all over the world.

The United States of America is the country where dreams come true. It's not hard to see that citizenship is a cornerstone of that American Dream. We're a Nation of immigrants—and immigration remains one of the great strengths of our great Nation.

Yesterday, we celebrated Citizenship Day and were reminded of the important contributions immigrants have made to America—immigrants from all over the world.

As Congress continues to delay the passage of comprehensive immigration reform, we're again reminded that the inclusion of a pathway to citizenship is essential to ensuring that all immigrants are able to fully contribute to our economy, workforce, and to our communities.

One of the major reasons that we have so many undocumented workers in this great Nation is because our legal immigration system is broken. We should work as hard as possible to ensure that hardworking men and women who simply want to live the American Dream can do so—and that they can do so as American citizens.

What happens when immigrants are able to become citizens rather than just seeing their immigration status legalized? The answer is simple. We—all of us in America—will have a stronger and more integrated Nation, a stronger

economy, and stronger communities. The economic benefits of citizenship are undeniable. Research shows failure to include a path to citizenship would have significant economic costs in terms of lost opportunity for growth, earnings, tax revenues, and jobs for Americans.

Providing only legal status with no pathway to citizenship would result in \$568 billion less in national productivity and \$321 billion less in total income, 820,000 fewer total jobs would be created, and Federal and State governments would lose out on \$75 billion in additional tax revenue, according to outside estimates.

□ 2000

Refusing immigrants the opportunity to become U.S. citizens hurts America. It hurts Americans as well. It hurts our economic interests as a country.

I want to fix our immigration system and to give those who are willing to work hard for this Nation and sacrifice of themselves an opportunity to do so as Americans. This is why I will continue to work with Democrats, Republicans, and anyone willing to listen to pass an immigration reform bill that is comprehensive and includes a path to citizenship.

At this time, I would like to take the opportunity to introduce Congressman STENY HOYER, the minority whip from Maryland. Maryland is one of the earliest States where immigrants landed. Even your State, Congressman HOYER, has a flag that represents those immigrants and their contributions to Maryland; correct?

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

He is absolutely correct, of course. The Maryland flag, which I think is one of the more distinctive State flags, has four quadrants, two of which represent the Baltimore family to which the Royal charter was given, as the gentleman observed, and two represent the Crossland family, which was the wife of Lord Baltimore. So I appreciate the gentleman referring to that. And of course all of us live in States that were started by immigrants.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my friend, Representative CÁRDENAS, and other distinguished Members who are here tonight to pay tribute to the immigrant heritage of our country.

"From her beacon hand glows world-wide welcome," wrote the poet Emma Lazarus. She went on with her poem to say:

"Keep, ancient lands, your storied pomp," cries she with silent lips. "Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to be free, the wretched refuse of your teeming shores. Send these, the homeless, the tempest-tossed, to me, I lift my lamp beside the golden door."

That iconic image we see so often is a symbol of America's welcome to those who would participate in making it better. But the poet was wrong. It was not the wretched refuse of the teeming shores that came to America.

It was some of the most risk-taking, courageous, entrepreneurial people. It took courage to leave their land, to leave their language, and to come to America. But because they had ambition and vision and hope, they came. And they helped to build the greatest Nation the world has ever seen. Those words engraved on the Statue of Liberty are a creed of which our Nation must always keep faith.

For Americans, citizenship means more than belonging to a place. It represents a sacred bond not only between those who carry it, but a sacred duty to make sure others can earn it who share our devotion to liberty and justice for all. Yes, those immigrants, they believed that declaration intoning pursuit of happiness. What a wonderful concept that "we hold these truths to be self-evident." Pursuit of happiness is one of those values that we hold forth to all the world.

You know, we hear a lot of talk, Mr. Speaker, on this floor and in our national discourse about what makes America exceptional, about what makes us unique and special among the nations of the world. The answer, I believe, is that we have brought together the best of all the nations of the world. Those who come seeking shelter on our shores do so because they want to work hard to succeed. They're willing to take the risk of leaving all that they know just for a chance to make it in America. That is why the Congress must pursue, Mr. Speaker, comprehensive immigration reform that includes a path to citizenship.

Mr. Speaker, 40 percent of all the Nobel Prize winners in America were born on foreign shores. They came here, contributed here, excelled here, and made our country better. Those who have come here to build a strong America—and those who were brought here as children and have known no other home—deserve a chance to keep contributing to this country through their hard work and their service to our communities.

Mr. Speaker, I am the son of an immigrant, an immigrant from Denmark. Serving with me in this Chamber are the sons and daughters, grandsons and granddaughters, great-grandsons and great-granddaughters, and yes, even more generations before. Grandsons of immigrants from Mexico, from Italy, from China, from Africa, from Eastern Europe, from the Caribbean, from Asia—indeed, from every land in this world.

In marking Citizenship Day, which was yesterday, it is up to us to make sure that our exceptional American idea of citizenship continues to manifest itself as an extended hand to all who love freedom, are committed to justice, and wish to build a strong America for all its people. Comprehensive immigration reform will enable us, as it has in the past, to keep that hand extended and bring into our society and economy those who believe in the power of the American Dream.

Mr. Speaker, let us work together, not as Democrats and Republicans, but as fellow immigrants. First, second, third, fourth, fifth, however many generations, we are the children of immigrants. Let us work together to fix our immigration system and ensure that the lamp beside the golden door continues to shine its light to enrich our Nation and continue to offer hope and inspiration for all the world.

I want to thank my colleague, TONY CÁRDENAS, from California. He is a new Member, but an extraordinarily experienced Member. He knows about immigration firsthand. I want to thank him for taking this Special Order because it is important for America to keep that lamp lifted. And to do so, Mr. Speaker, we need, as Mr. CÁRDENAS has said, to pass a comprehensive immigration bill. And, Mr. Speaker, we ought to pass it this year.

I thank the gentleman for taking the time. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Thank you very much, Congressman HOYER. I appreciate those eloquent words and also the fact that you pointed out that you are definitely a proud American, yet at the same time you are proud to say that you're the son of immigrants. That's a beautiful thing for us to welcome and embrace in this country. I hope and pray that we do, in fact, pass comprehensive immigration reform and pass it soon. So thank you so much for your leadership.

Next, Mr. Speaker, I would like to invite to share a few words with all of us my colleague, MARC VEASEY, from the Dallas/Fort Worth metroplex area.

Congressman VEASEY, I know Texas is a State of proud patriots, and they must have been very proud when we read from the Constitution earlier this year at the beginning of our session. That document is the basis of a lot of what makes our country so appealing to those people from all over the world who want to come here and contribute to this great Nation; isn't it?

Mr. VEASEY. Absolutely.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Why don't you tell us a little bit about what being a citizen is like and what it means to you and the folks in your district, many of whom protect and defend our great Nation.

Mr. VEASEY. Congressman CÁRDENAS, I thank you very much for doing this. I would like to thank my friend from the Golden State of California for leading this important discussion. I'm also very proud that this is a very diverse group that is here today to talk about the importance of citizenship and diversity.

As it was pointed out a minute ago by STENY HOYER, our whip, he talked about his background and him being a first-generation American. So many of the contributions and so many of the things that make America what it is today is because of immigrants. This discussion is very important. And Congressman HOYER is right; we need to

pass a comprehensive immigration reform bill because it's the right thing to do.

When you talk about the growth and you look at the gross domestic product, U.S. personal income, I can tell you in my own personal State of Texas what immigrants mean to our vibrant economy. We have so many people that are moving to our State every day. And much of that success that we are experiencing in Texas, the Lone Star State, particularly in Dallas/Fort Worth metropolitan area, is because of immigrant growth.

This week we celebrate 226 years since the U.S. Constitutional Convention was signed into law. Since that time, America's Constitution has been seen as the backbone for the rights and freedoms of all U.S. citizens. The U.S. Constitution is the epitome of what it means to be an American citizen in our country. September 17, the day it was adopted, is a day to celebrate what this document means for those who have become or who aspire to be U.S. citizens.

Throughout our Nation's history, immigrants have embraced the spirit of liberty, justice, and equality for all. These were the same principles that guided the Framers of the Constitution as they built a stronger republic. The Founding Fathers felt that the people who immigrated and spent years building lives in this country deserved citizenship. We should have that same spirit today in this body.

They were keenly aware that making new immigrants wait a long time for citizenship denied them the very rights that Americans had just fought to claim for themselves. By guaranteeing a uniform rule of naturalization, the Constitution presupposes an immigrant nation. Let's join the Framers by pledging to support and defend the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America.

Each year during Citizenship Day, we recognize the newest members of the American family as they pledge allegiance to our Constitution in naturalization ceremonies across our great country. This week, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services will welcome over 18,000 new U.S. citizens during more than 180 naturalization ceremonies hailed across the country.

As thousands take their first step towards the American Dream, we must all recognize the obstacles that still exist for so many others who long to contribute to the next chapter of America's story. The steps toward becoming a citizen are riddled with difficult, confusing, and very expensive hurdles. In addition to the cost and bureaucracy, there are also some individuals in the community preying on immigrants, taking their money and telling them they are guaranteed citizenship.

Our national, economic, social, and cultural vibrancy are the direct result of labor and efforts of generations of immigrants. According to the Center

for the Study of Immigrant Integration at the University of Southern California, income rises an average of 8 to 11 percent when immigrants become citizens.

Delaying and ignoring real problems in our broken immigration system for political purposes has not brought solutions; it has only brought heartache for the many families who wish to assimilate and make America stronger.

In the spirit of Citizenship Day, I stand with my colleagues to recognize the many benefits that immigrants bring to the United States of America.

Mrs. Velasquez-Acosta came to this country from El Salvador and became a naturalized U.S. citizen. Now her son Sam works in the office of a Member of the United States House of Representatives. In fact, he serves the constituents of the 33rd Congressional District in the congressional office that I represent. He is truly a living person that can tell you the benefits of immigration—he and his family.

I believe that there is a level of optimism because I see it in Sam and I see it in so many others who reside in the 33rd Congressional District, the level of optimism that immigrants have historically brought to this country and to our State. When you bring new people into the American family, you energize and get others involved.

□ 2015

We must focus on the urgency of helping the almost 9 million legal permanent residents who are eligible for citizenship in this country. We must help them take those final steps toward the American Dream so they can fully become a part of the Democratic process. That's what it's all about.

Today, we must rededicate ourselves to pass comprehensive immigration reform. This fair, commonsense system would include a pathway to citizenship for those here now, a family reunification system, and a market-based structure that meets legitimate labor needs, protecting both the interest of American workers and industry.

As a nation of immigrants, let us celebrate the long line of aspiring citizens who have had a positive impact on our history. Immigrants have enriched our character, contributed to our economy by founding businesses and creating jobs, and have sacrificed their livelihoods so that they could defend our freedoms and secure a brighter future for our children.

The men who signed our Constitution 226 years ago—226 years ago—envisioned the United States as a land of opportunity. Today, as legislators, we are charged with building on that same vision, and our Nation will be stronger for it.

I thank my friend from California for using this time to talk about something that is so important to our country. We can no longer wait. The time is now.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Thank you very much, Congressman VEASEY. Thank

you for sharing those words with all of us.

Mr. Speaker, next I would like to introduce KYRSTEN SINEMA from Arizona. She knows what dreams are made of and what it takes to be a participant in making those dreams come true.

Ms. SINEMA. Thank you, Mr. CÁRDENAS, for holding this event this evening. I appreciate the time.

Mr. Speaker, many others who will be speaking this evening will spend time talking about the numbers or the benefits of changing our immigration laws in our country.

I'm going to tell just one brief story about my district. When I was elected to Congress earlier this year, I was invited, as many Members of Congress are, to address and welcome newly sworn-in citizens. As the swearing-in ceremony was happening on a day that I was in Washington, a member of my team back in Phoenix joined that citizenship ceremony and spoke on my behalf.

After the event was over, I asked her how it went. It was her first time speaking publicly on behalf of our office, and I asked her what it was like. She answered by telling me about her experience.

The staffer who went to the citizenship ceremony on my behalf is a young woman named Erika Andiola. Erika Andiola is a Dreamer. She was born in Mexico and brought to this country as a young person. She went to junior high and high school in Phoenix, Arizona. She later went to Arizona State University and graduated with high honors. She now works for me in my office as an outreach director.

Erika spoke to the individuals who had just become citizens at the citizenship ceremony and welcomed them as new citizens to our country. What she said to me afterwards was that one day she hopes to sit in that citizenship ceremony herself and to become a citizen of these United States.

Mr. CÁRDENAS, members of the Ninth District, fellow citizens of this country, this is the reason we must get the immigration reform. Young people like Erika Andiola have lived in this United States for almost their entire lives and know no other country. While they watch others become citizens, they still dream for that day themselves.

Mr. CÁRDENAS, we must make that happen for Erika.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Thank you very much, Congresswoman SINEMA.

Next, I would like to invite to share a few words with all of us Congressman O'ROURKE from Texas.

Congressman, a lot of us have talked about citizenship and what it means when you raise your hand and swear allegiance to this country, and the many ways that immigrants have contributed to our great Nation. But for you I think it touches a little closer to home.

I've heard there's a new American citizen in your district who has made a major contribution to your congressional office. Can you share with us that story?

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, I am very honored to be here today to speak on the topic of immigration reform, immigration reform that is humane, that is rational, that is fiscally responsible, and to be doing so with the guidance and leadership of Congressman CÁRDENAS, my friend from California, who despite his short tenure in Congress has really emerged as a leader on this very important issue—important to me, important to the community I represent in El Paso, Texas, important to our State, and important to our country. Frankly, just to extend it one more time, important to the world, because I think the world's eyes are on us today, they're on us as we decide how we are going to respond to this opportunity, this once in a 20- or 30-year opportunity to make meaningful, positive changes in our broken immigration system, because as STENY HOYER said earlier, "we are proudly a Nation of immigrants."

I'm sure it is this way for the gentleman from California, but for me the moral and ethical reasons are the most compelling—to do the right thing for those people who are already in our communities, for the people who have so much to offer who have yet to come to our shores and will add to the economy, to the civic strength of our communities and make the places that we live in and the country that we call home a better place.

I think of Edgar Falcon, a constituent of mine, a U.S. citizen, who is working. While he's working, he's also going to nursing school to improve his life, his ability to compete in the marketplace, his opportunity to contribute back to the community that we live in.

To complete his life beyond his education and his work and everything that he has done in the community, he wants to marry the woman of his dreams, a woman named Maricruz, who currently lives in Durango, Mexico, who would love to be here with the man that she loves.

But unfortunately, because of our current broken immigration system, she's unable to live here in the United States with the man that she loves. He's unable to bring her here because when she was a child, her sister, while they were crossing into the United States, falsely claimed citizenship for the both of them. Under our current broken immigration system, that has earned her a lifetime ban from reentry to the United States.

So despite the fact that an American citizen, someone I represent, someone who pays taxes into our government, someone who is by all measures doing everything he can to make our community and our country a better place, he cannot be with the woman he loves because of what I think to be a very arbitrary and unhelpful law that is separating two people who deeply love each other.

What we need to do is correct this through comprehensive immigration reform and through a measure that

we'll be introducing this week, the American Families United Act, that will allow judges some level of discretion in cases like these where we have someone who poses no threat to our country, who can pay a fine, do some sort of penance for a mistake they made or a family member made on their behalf, and then if it makes sense for our community and our security is secured, they are able to join our community, the person that they want to marry, a U.S. citizen.

I hope that we'll have others who will join us in cosponsoring this legislation that we'll introduce this week because there are literally thousands upon thousands of American families, families of U.S. citizens, who are affected negatively by this immigration law.

As I said earlier, we want to do the right thing for the right reasons, for the moral imperative. Coming from El Paso, Texas, we really have been the Ellis Island for much of Latin America, including Mexico. The people who came through our ports of entry ended up in Los Angeles, they ended up in California, they went to Chicago, they went to New York, they went to all points east, west and north, and then many tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands, chose to stay in El Paso.

It is because of those immigrants, both legal and unauthorized immigrants I would argue, that El Paso today is the safest city in the United States. It was the safest city last year as well, it was the safest city the year before that. For the last 10 years, El Paso has been one of the top five safest cities in the United States.

When we hear people, who I think out of ignorance, say that we need to secure the border before we move forward with comprehensive immigration reform, I tell them that today we are spending \$18 billion on border security, more than we are spending on all other Federal law enforcement agencies combined, that we've built hundreds of miles of fencing, that net migration last year from Mexico was actually zero, that El Paso is the safest city, San Diego is the second-safest. The U.S. side of the U.S. border compared to the rest of the country is far safer. We do not have a border security problem today. The border has never been more secure or more safe.

For all of those reasons, all of the moral ones and all of the commonsense ones that I just cited, we should do the right thing. Yet that is not enough for some people.

I will conclude by saying this. It is in our moral interest as a country that wants to do the right thing. It makes all the common sense in the world to do the right thing. But if we look at our economic self-interest, today it is already proven that immigrants, including unauthorized immigrants, contribute far more to our economy, they contribute far more to our tax base, they contribute far more to job opportunities and quality of life than they take in benefits. That has, I think,

been proven beyond a shadow of a doubt.

What we also know is that if some form of the current proposal for comprehensive immigration reform passes, the CBO has scored it such that within the first 10 years these new immigrants to our country who will be on a path to citizenship will be able to reduce our deficit by more than \$150 billion. In the next 10 years, those same immigrants will reduce our deficit an additional \$800 to \$900 billion. They'll also be contributors into Social Security, one of the pillars of our social safety net, one that is unable to meet its obligations in the not too distant future. This is surely going to help us to shore up Social Security as well.

So whether we look at the moral dynamic, whether we look at what makes common sense for our communities and our country, or whether we look at our economic self-interest, comprehensive immigration reform that is rational, that is humane, and that is fiscally responsible, makes sense for this country.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Thank you very much, Congressman O'ROURKE. We appreciate the opportunity to hear a perspective from your part of Texas and our great country.

Next, I would like to welcome and talk a little bit with Congressman BILL FOSTER of Illinois, a little bit right now.

Congressman FOSTER, part of the American Dream is owning a home. I, myself, was a real estate broker before getting involved in elected office, and I know that it's tough for those people who want to own a home if they don't have their documentation in order or their citizenship in order. We have a lot of vacant homes around the country, and I know we have some in your district and in my district.

Do you think that more American citizens working hard and contributing to our economy would help our home-buying market?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to highlight the many important contributions that immigrants make to our Nation and our economy, to our scientific progress, and to say a few special words on the positive impact that comprehensive immigration reform will have on the real estate market in our country.

We are a Nation of immigrants. Many of us are second- or third-generation Americans, and we have all benefited from the sacrifices that our ancestors made in search of a better life in America.

In fact, my wife is a first-generation Asian-American who came to the United States to pursue her education, and was able to become a legal immigrant and a citizen and a Ph.D., in fact, but who knows that even our legal immigration system does not work as well as it should.

Every day, families come to this country in search of the American Dream—better jobs, better education, and a better life for their families.

I am proud to represent many of these families, but would like to share just one incredible story of one of my constituents, Juventino Cano. Growing up, Juventino lived on a farm in Colima, Mexico, with his parents and six brothers and sisters. Their home didn't have lights or electricity, and they all worked long hours on the family farm to make ends meet.

When he was 17 years old, his stepbrothers encouraged him to come to Aurora, Illinois, and told him about the wonderful opportunities that awaited him in America. He was able to get a job with his stepbrothers at a packaging company.

By 1986, Juventino not only held a steady job and had learned English, but he had opened his own company, Cano Container Corporation, in Aurora, Illinois. What started with a single machine and three employees has now grown into a company with over \$20 million a year in annual sales. Today, not only is Juventino the president and CEO of the Cano Container Company, he also serves on the board of directors for the United States Hispanic Chamber of Commerce and as the president of the board of directors of the Aurora Hispanic Chamber of Commerce.

□ 2030

Cano Container Company has also received its share of accolades, including being named the minority manufacturer of the year by the United States Department of Commerce in 2007.

The city and the economy of Aurora, Illinois, have greatly benefited from Juventino's many contributions to the community. His story reminds us that immigration reform is good for economic growth. More than 40 percent of Fortune 500 companies were founded by immigrants or children of immigrants. These American companies represent seven of the 10 most valuable brands in the world and collectively employ more than 10 million people and generate annual revenue of \$4.2 trillion. That's a quarter of our economy.

Additionally, immigrants have a huge impact on our housing market, and passage of comprehensive immigration reform will have a huge positive impact on our still-recovering real estate markets. A study from Harvard University found that in recent years, foreign-born households accounted for 30 percent of the overall growth in the housing sector.

According to the "2012 State of Hispanic Homeownership" report, it is likely that comprehensive immigration reform would generate 3 million new Hispanic home buyers over the next several years. Every day that we fail to pass comprehensive immigration reform, we are forfeiting millions of dollars of economic growth and tax revenue and slowing the recovery of our housing markets.

If we passed immigration reform that provides a pathway to citizenship for undocumented immigrants, it would increase State and local tax collections

by almost \$150 million a year in Illinois alone. On the other hand, if all unauthorized immigrants were removed from Illinois, the State would lose \$25.6 billion in economic activity, \$11.4 billion in gross State product, and approximately 120,000 jobs.

As a scientist, I've also seen firsthand the valuable contributions that immigrants make. For 20 years, I worked as a physicist at Fermi National Lab in Illinois, and every day the flags from dozens of countries flew outside the facilities representing the nationalities of all of the scientists performing experiments at Fermilab.

Thousands of students from other countries have come to the U.S. to get their Ph.D.s and training at our research facilities, and it has been the policy of our country to turn most of them away when the work is done and their education is complete. While this may have made sense in the years after World War II when we were trying to avoid the brain drain from countries trying to rebuild themselves, times have changed. The economic winds are now blowing in both directions, and we need to stop pushing our accomplished scientists and researchers out of our country and instead encourage them to stay here and to build businesses, expand their research, and help grow our economy. The comprehensive immigration bill passed by the Senate does exactly that: it encourages the best and brightest scientists and researchers to stay here and add to our economy and our R&D capabilities.

As we contemplate a pathway to citizenship for the 11 million undocumented immigrants and consider reforming our legal immigration system, let's remember all of the contributions that immigrants, past and present, have made to our country.

Our Nation has a long and proud history of welcoming immigrants in search of a better life for themselves and their families, but our current immigration system is broken. We now have a historic opportunity to bring 11 million people out of the shadows.

We have to remember that at any moment we are just 5 days away from passing immigration reform and having it be the law of the land. All it will take is for Speaker BOEHNER to wake up one morning and listen to the voices of his church, listen to the voices of the chambers of commerce, listen to the voices of business and ordinary people all over this country and decide to bring the Senate immigration bill up for a vote where it will pass with a bipartisan majority and be signed into law by the President.

This would be a historic moment and exactly the kind of bipartisanship that people expect from their elected representatives. If and when Speaker BOEHNER decides to act and allow the House a vote to pass the Senate immigration bill, we could boost our economy, including our real estate markets, reduce our national debt and, most importantly, bring 11 million peo-

ple out of the shadows. We cannot let this opportunity pass us by.

Mr. CARDENAS. Thank you very much.

Next I would like to yield to Congresswoman LOIS CAPPs.

Congresswoman, both of us are from California, and we've seen the incredible impact that immigrants have made in our great State of California. Recognizing those contributions is not a partisan matter for us in California now, is it?

One thing that I'd like for you to share with us, please, is your perspective on whether or not this is a partisan issue.

Mrs. CAPPs. I thank my colleague from California, TONY CÁRDENAS. And, yes, I do have a letter that I will share, but I want to discuss the matter in general first and thank my colleague for organizing all of us to be here to address a topic that is of central importance to our State of California and the entire country.

I join my colleagues in strong support for comprehensive immigration reform. We honor the many contributions that immigrants have made to our country during Citizenship Day this week, but we cannot forget the millions of immigrants left behind by our broken immigration system. These are the immigrants who contribute to key sectors of our economy. They are such a vital part of agriculture, housing, manufacturing, retail, hospitality, tourism, engineering, technology, and on and on.

These are hardworking people, immigrants who often face separation from their families, lower wages, and face the fear of deportation; and this forces them to take their skills often to our competitors at great disadvantage to our own economy. We can all agree that our current immigration system is not working. It's holding back our country and our economy, and now is the time to fix it.

While I've been traveling in my congressional district, I've heard personally from business sectors of our economy on the central coast of California that are hurt on a daily basis by this broken immigration system. There are high-tech companies in Goleta, California, frustrated by seeing many of our brightest UC Santa Barbara graduates being sent back to their native countries to work for competitive companies and countries because of a lack of high-skilled worker visas.

I've met with growers in California's agriculture industry who are so important in my local economy, critical to our national economy, and who struggle to find a stable and a consistent workforce. This threatens the sustainability of our crops.

I've met with workforce and labor organizations who want to ensure workers can earn fair wages and contribute to our economy and our communities. We must act now to establish a fair, but tough, pathway to citizenship to provide the security and stability our economy needs.

I now refer to the chart which indicates so graphically the difference between a path to legalization only and the strong advantages of that pathway to citizenship.

Comprehensive reform would boost California's economy alone by \$7.3 billion. It would create nearly 77,000 new jobs in our State of California just next year. This should be one of our Nation's top priorities.

Mr. Speaker, I would also note for the record that while Members of my party are very enthusiastic about advancing comprehensive immigration reform, this is an issue with strong bipartisan support. For example, the Senate passed comprehensive immigration reform on a strong bipartisan vote not too long ago, and just last week a number of Republican members of the California State legislature made their voices heard on this issue—and that's the letter to which you referred. They sent a letter to their Federal counterparts urging us to take action in the House. These are Republican legislators from California on comprehensive immigration reform. I would like to now submit this letter into the RECORD.

This letter outlines components of comprehensive reform that most of us agree need to be included, that is, the opportunity for undocumented residents to earn their way to citizenship.

Wisely, the California State Republican legislators wrote—and this is a quote from their letter:

There is no policy debate more important to the future of California and of America than passing comprehensive immigration reform.

I could not agree more.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, it is time that we have the opportunity here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives to debate and to finally have a vote on comprehensive immigration reform. Our country, our economy simply cannot wait any longer.

Thank you for the time, my colleague from California.

CALIFORNIA STATE
REPUBLICAN LEGISLATORS

To: California Republican Congressional Delegation:

Doug LaMalfa, 1st District
Tom McClintock, 4th District
Paul Cook, 8th District
Jeff Denham, 10th District
David Valadao, 21st District
Devin Nunes, 22nd District
Kevin McCarthy, 23rd District
Buck McKeon, 25th District
Gary Miller, 31st District
Ed Royce, 39th District
Ken Calvert, 42nd District
John Campbell, 45th District
Dana Rohrabacher, 48th District
Darrell Issa, 49th District
Duncan Hunter, 50th District

We, the undersigned California State legislative Republicans, strongly support federal comprehensive immigration reform and urge our state Republican Congressional delegation to encourage Speaker John Boehner to call a vote on immigration reform.

Components should include thoughtful and strong border security, employer sanctions,

and opportunity for undocumented residents to earn their way to full citizenship, but only behind those who have applied to become citizens through the current citizenship process.

There is no policy debate more important to the future of California and America than passing comprehensive immigration reform. By providing legal clarity to the status of millions of people in California, we can spur an economic renaissance, solidify families, and create an entirely new population of full taxpayers, many of whom who have strong entrepreneurial and work ethics.

We stand with the business community, the labor community, farmers, manufacturers, communities of faith, and most importantly Californians, in our call for Congress to act on reform this year to put this challenge behind us as a state and nation. We strongly urge House Republicans to demand a vote.

While some members in Congress may not support the legislation, every member deserves the opportunity to vote. We understand that members have divergent views on reform, but this is the time to address the many serious issues immigrants and their employers face every day.

This group of Republican legislators is asking our friends in business, labor and agriculture, who work with these immigrants in their fields, homes and factories every day to join us in asking Congressional Leaders to "Call the Vote."

Respectfully,

Senator Anthony Cannella, SD 12; Senator Steve Knight, SD 21; Senator Bill Emmerson, SD 27; Senator Tom Berryhill, SD 14.

Assembly Republican Leader Connie Conway, AD 26; Assemblymember Jeff Gorell, AD 44; Assemblymember Kristin Olsen, AD 12; Assemblymember Rocky Chavez, AD 76; Assemblymember Katcho Achadjian, AD 35; Assemblymember Jim Patterson, AD 23; Assemblymember Allan Mansoor, AD 74; Assemblymember Don Wagner, AD 68; Assemblymember Brian Maisenschein, AD 77; Assemblymember Eric Linder, AD 60; Assemblymember Brian Dahle, AD 1.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Thank you very much, Congresswoman CAPPS.

I now yield to Dr. RAUL RUIZ, who represents the southern part of California, to express some of his understanding of why comprehensive immigration reform is good for America and good for Americans.

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the good gentleman from California, Congressman CÁRDENAS.

Immigrants from all over the world have made tremendous contributions to our society and our economy since the birth of our Nation. Our immigrant families are an invaluable part of our country.

For far too long, Congress has failed to act on a comprehensive plan for immigration reform.

I believe that any immigration reform plan would be bipartisan, secure our borders, uphold the immigration laws we already have, protect our workers and businesses, and include a pathway to citizenship for those who work hard and play by the rules.

Passing a commonsense comprehensive immigration reform bill would lead to an economic boom in the Coachella Valley and across the country.

Nonpartisan, independent studies have shown that comprehensive immigration reform will reduce the deficit by nearly \$850 billion over the next 20 years and reduce our Federal debt. It will also increase economic growth and strengthen our economy by expanding our labor force, increasing investment, and increasing overall productivity. It will also provide a significant boost to our tourism and agriculture sectors, two of the top industries in my district in the Coachella Valley.

In the Coachella Valley, tourism industries will benefit substantially from some of the provisions in the bipartisan Senate bill, like the Visa Waiver Program. Additionally, our U.S. agriculture output and exports will grow once our farmers have access to the stable workforce they need.

Comprehensive immigration reform means more jobs and more opportunity for people in my district and across the country, but only if we act.

I stand ready to work with both Democrats and Republicans toward a comprehensive immigration system that is rooted in common sense. It is time to put aside the political games and work together in a bipartisan effort to address this critical challenge.

Thank you, Congressman CÁRDENAS, for this session.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Thank you so much, Congressman RUIZ.

Before I call up our next Congressman from Florida, I'd like to share a story with everyone. Mr. Speaker, about economics and innovation.

Cesar Millan was born in 1969 in Culiacan, Sinaloa, Mexico. He grew up working with animals on his grandfather's farm in Sinaloa.

Young Millan crossed the border in the U.S. without a visa at the age of 21. He spoke no English and did not know anyone in this country. He first worked in a dog grooming store working with the most aggressive dogs that nobody else would want to work with.

Mr. Millan became a permanent resident in the year 2000. He was focused on rehabilitating especially aggressive dogs and founded the Dog Psychology Center in south Los Angeles, and he held that center there from 2002 to 2009, which, in fact, was a business.

He started a television series, "The Dog Whisperer with Cesar Millan," which was broadcast in more than 80 countries around the world between 2004 and 2012. The show became National Geographic's number one show during its first season.

Starting in January 2013, Cesar Millan has hosted another series, "Cesar Millan's Leader of the Pack." Cesar Millan has written three books, all of which became New York Times bestsellers. In 2009, Cesar Millan launched "Cesar's Way" magazine in the United States and Canada, which combines advice from Cesar and articles about relationships between dogs and humans. It is the number one selling dog magazine in North America.

□ 2045

In 2007, Cesar and Ilusion Millan created the Cesar and Ilusion Millan Foundation, a not-for-profit to aid and support the rescue, rehabilitation, and placement of abused and abandoned dogs. Cesar Millan has also supported other projects, including K-9 Connection for at-risk teens, Pups on Parole for inmates, and It Gets Better that supports at-risk LGBT youth as well.

I was present in 2009—and it was a proud moment for me and a proud moment for Cesar Millan and his family—when he raised his hand and was sworn in as a United States citizen in 2009 in Los Angeles, California. And I can tell you, his efforts and his contributions to this great Nation go much further.

While watching television, my wife, Norma, looked at the TV and she said, You know what, Tony? You need to meet Cesar Millan. He looks like a good man, and he looks like somebody who can help you create good legislation for the city of Los Angeles, when I was on the city council of Los Angeles.

So I invited him to my office, and immediately he said he'd be more than happy to help me. And as a result of that one meeting, he helped me create the first spay and neuter program in the largest city in the United States of America. Now it's the model for cities around the country. And it was his advice and his expertise that allowed me to do that.

Los Angeles, for over 20 years, had not prosecuted one person for cruelty to animals, and it was Cesar Millan who urged me that we need to put an end to that. And with that, in Los Angeles, I was able to pass an ordinance that created an animal cruelty task force. And today, we have prosecuted over 200 individuals with felony charges for cruelty to animals.

Basically what I'm saying is it was an undocumented immigrant who came to this country who taught me, an American-born citizen, how I can take my craft as an elected official to a level that had never been done before. And it's that kind of example that I believe we have example after example after example in this country that immigrants who come to this country, documented or undocumented, seize the opportunity of the atmosphere that we've created in this great country. And they are tremendous contributors not only to our economy, but to good legislation and making our communities a better place.

And now I would like to invite to speak a few words Congressman JOE GARCIA from Florida to share what his perspective on comprehensive immigration reform means to this country and why it's so important to our great Nation.

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I have the great opportunity to come from a community that, in large part, has been built by immigrants. I am the son of refugees to this great country. And here's what we know:

We know that immigrants add to America's way of life; they create more opportunity for all; they make our country better; they make American citizens richer.

Here's what we know:

We know that in the next 10 years, if we find a pathway for legalization, over \$100 billion of additional capital will be added to our country. What we know is that in the next 20 years, that will be over \$870 billion. In fact, what we know is that they will almost provide \$1 trillion of economic growth over the next 20 years.

It's important to understand that immigrants bolster our country, make our country better, and they add to it.

I lived in south Florida during very tough times for immigrants. I remember, as a young man, seeing bumper stickers on the back of cars that said, "Would the last American leaving Miami please bring the flag." What I know is that the flag still flies high in Miami. It is a leading beacon for work and opportunity in our country because people didn't give up on the dream of our country. They continued to work and they continued to make a difference.

And that is exactly what we have to understand is that immigrants bolster our country. They bolster America's private sector by consuming more goods, more services, providing increased income. All this, in turn, creates more jobs and greater income for all Americans.

What we know is that by 2022, over 820,000 more workers will be created because of the need, \$321 billion of increased income for all Americans. The GDP increases by \$568 billion if all non-citizens, undocumented and those illegal residents in the country, were to be legalized. This is a boon for our country. It creates opportunity. It makes for a better America.

I thank the gentleman from California for doing this because of course what he's doing is trying to save this country, to make it better. There has never been a great country, a great nation in the history of the world that was shedding citizens. In fact, all great countries welcome opportunity. They welcome those who come to provide.

We need a comprehensive immigration system not only because we need more workers, but we need the intellectual capital that they bring. We need that drive, that vigor that they add to our country. And the fight for comprehensive immigration reform is one that makes all Americans better, makes our country richer, and makes opportunity for all, creating the motto that lives in our country.

So again, I want to thank the gentleman from California for his efforts. I know he's one of many in the House. And what we do know is that if a bill came to this floor, it would have majority support. The Senate passed it, and this House could pass it if the leadership would allow it to get to the floor.

More than enough of the Members of this Chamber understand the benefits of immigration, understand that it is necessary for our country's greatness, and understand that it is what we will do inevitably. Let's do it now. Let's do it right. Let's get it done.

Mr. CARDENAS. Thank you, Congressman GARCIA. I really appreciate that perspective and your sharing with America those perspectives.

I would like to share another story of someone that I'm friends with and someone who has a business in my district and also lives in my district.

Alonso Arellano was born in 1966 in Tijuana, Mexico. He came to America when he was 10 years old with his mother and stepdad and brother. His family settled in Huntington Park, California, where his father worked at a factory job and his mother sold goods to make some extra money. He had to withdraw from high school in the 10th grade because of the family's economic hardships and began working to help support his family. But he had a passion for learning and was determined to get an education, so he completed high school by taking night classes while working full-time, and went on to take courses at a junior college to continue his education.

In 1986, he got married. And when he found out his wife was pregnant a couple of years later, he began to reevaluate his life and what he was going to do next for his family. So he joined the United States Air Force in 1988, where he won the Airman of the Quarter Award three times, received a commendation medal, and graduated from training with honors. He was granted the permission to take classes at Eastern New Mexico University nearby the base where he was stationed, and he eventually earned a bachelor's degree in physics and a master's degree in mathematics.

After the war, Alonso applied for and was granted U.S. citizenship, which opened the door for his future career. When he left the military in 1994, he began training at UCLA to become a radiation medical physicist while working part time at UCLA at a cancer research center. He currently works as a radiation medical physicist at a private hospital. In addition to that, he owns and runs a restaurant called Rocio's Mole de los Dioses. And right now, he's planning on opening up another business, creating jobs for Americans, creating jobs in our community, our corner of America.

I think it's important for people to understand that immigrants have such an insatiable appetite to appreciate their surroundings, appreciate their opportunities, just like Alonso, who had to get out of school at the 10th grade, who worked full-time, went to night school to get his education, went on to get a bachelor's degree, a master's degree, and now is contributing in a health care facility for patients with cancer, who is actually contributing by opening several businesses where he employs American citizens.

I want to thank my colleagues for joining me tonight on this floor to share the stories of truth and the stories about how important comprehensive immigration reform is to the economy of America. Once again, 82,000 more jobs if we allow these new Americans to become citizens, \$568 billion more growth in GDP to the United States economy if we allow them to become citizens, \$75 billion more in revenue to local States and governments if we allow them to become citizens, \$321 billion of growth in dollars in the pockets of American families that will be spent throughout our communities in America.

As I close, I would like to thank NALEO, NCLR, and countless other businesses, chambers, labor, civil rights, religious, and law enforcement organizations, individuals who are continuing to push for the truth, to push Congress to please have comprehensive immigration reform meet the floor of both Houses so we can reconcile this, fix our broken immigration system, and put it on the desk of the President of the United States, and we will see an economic boon that this country has not seen for decades.

Americans deserve for us to operate in these Chambers the way we should, to put aside the partisan bickering, to look at the economic benefit of every community in our country, to do the right thing, to live the spirit of what the United States of America portends to be around the world. We need to start at home and realize that we have 11 million hardworking people in this country who are doing the toughest jobs, changing the diapers of our children, working in the kitchens of every nice, wonderful restaurant in America, people who are working with our grandparents to help them live a better life. Many of those individuals deserve the opportunity to come out of the shadows, and not only come out of the shadows, but to contribute to this great Nation with more economics that we need to see. We have an ailing economy, ladies and gentlemen. And with that, Mr. Speaker, we will see growth in America. We will see more Americans go to work if we do the right thing and pass comprehensive immigration reform.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's been a wonderful hour of truth and message to the American people, and I hope and pray that in these Chambers we have the opportunity to vote for comprehensive immigration reform.

I yield back the balance of my time.

SMART SPENDING CUTS STARTING WITH THE CENSUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARR). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) for 30 minutes.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is good to be back here working on the floor of this House. As we have

gotten back started, there are a lot of issues, there are a lot of things being debated, even here tonight being spoken of from a factor of truth and things that I think the American people sent us here to do.

They sent us here to look after the people's House, to do the business of America and make sure that the important interests that they care about, which are their lives and their businesses, their families, those are the things that we need to be about. And I know from our prospects on the Republican side, that is exactly what we're looking at to foster jobs and create growth and to do the things that matter.

But while I was home over the August work period, I got a lot of questions from longtime friends and also folks that had I not met. Over the time frame, we spoke to more groups than I could count. We talked to individuals, whether they be in the Kroger shopping center, whether they be in a coffee shop, whether they were in town hall meetings or all over, we experienced the Ninth District again as we went out and listened to our constituency. And what I had learned about the first few months was a lot of things that they wanted to ask me about.

You see, I have got questions about the budget. I have got questions about taxes. I have got questions about how we were going to prevent ObamaCare from going into effect. And I'm glad to stand here tonight and say that this Friday we're living up to the promise, as we have already worked to repeal parts of this legislation and to put this back on a foundation which the President can no longer just do by executive order whatever he would like, even in contradiction to black letter law.

When we look at the issues of ObamaCare going forward on Friday on this House floor, we are going to move forward with a continuing resolution to keep this government functioning while, at the same time, protecting Americans from a bad health care law.

□ 2100

Do not let anyone—if you're watching tonight, do not let anyone tell you any different. Republicans want to keep the government functioning and protect Americans at the same time. We can do that. That's why we were sent here.

All those things that we were asked questions about, from ObamaCare to taxes to budget, but also Benghazi and IRS. And a little over a year ago, on the floor of this House, and all of America, we were horrified at the sights of Benghazi. And to know that this week we're continuing to look and to find the truth, so not just we look backwards and remember, but that we look forward so that we can put into place things that matter and things that will help those from the Ninth District of Georgia and all over the country who want to go into Foreign Service, who want to serve their coun-

try, so that when they go overseas to serve, they will know that if trouble comes we have their back. Those are the things that the Ninth District were talking to me about, and those are the things that this Congress and this Republican majority are putting a priority on.

But while I was at home, I was also fortunate enough to get to talk to people who don't have time to focus on inside-the-Beltway issues. In fact, they really don't look to inside the Beltway to determine how they're going to get up and live each day.

In fact, when I go home and visit constituents in hardware stores and pharmacies and small businesses where regular Americans go on a daily basis, I'm reminded of why my constituents elected me to be here. These are the places populated by the people who don't ask for much for their government. They just pay their taxes. They pay their bills.

They get up in the mornings, they send their kids to school, and they go to work, and they come back home in the evenings and they go to ball games and they go to their parents' house. They take care of their relatives, they take care of their neighbors. They look after their schools. They look after their communities.

And what they want is just a government that leaves them alone, that does what it's supposed to do, while they do what they're supposed to do.

You see, they don't believe that government is the solution to all problems. In fact, they don't look to Washington for their solution. They look for Washington to do what it was supposed to do, as the Founders intended: to be a form of limited government, a place that provides a healthy playing field, but it only provides it within the limited confines of the Constitution and what the Founders intended this organization and this government to be.

When we look at this, they look around, they scratch their head and they say, when they see Washington not working, when they see it overreaching, when they see it getting into their lives and affecting their businesses and keeping their business from expanding by regulation that continues to tear down the fabric of new business growth through our banking sector and others, through our manufacturing sector, and removing the jobs at the expense of growing government jobs, they want to know, they say, "Doug, can Washington be fixed?"

Fixing the small things sometimes is not real vogue in this town. And when we think about that, and when they ask me the question, can Washington be fixed, I'm able to tell them that we can fix Washington, but it's going to take hard work and a lot of focus, which the people of the Ninth District of Georgia know a lot about, and also a lot of our country. In fact, our country is based on hard work and focus, and that's what makes this country great.

First of all, we're going to have to start by fixing the small things. They

sent us here to Washington to fix it, but we often get so focused on the big ticket items of the day that we miss out on reforming the small things that are right in front of us, the things that can actually be fixed without a drawn-out, partisan fight.

And I say so many times, people say, what are you fighting about? And many times it's hard to explain. But there are some things that we can do that we can all agree upon. There are spending categories all over the Federal Government where billions of dollars are being wasted and not put to good use.

In fact, in my time here looking back through the reports from the Government Accountability Office, you see the same programs listed as high risk year after year. We're ignoring billions of dollars in savings by overlooking the small things.

I am a big believer that if you do the small things regularly and consistently, they become habit. And we, as a government, if we would focus on the small things, if we focused on the things that mattered and the things that we could get agreement on, then the American people would, slowly but surely, begin to rebuild the trust that they have in this institution.

You see, one of the things I want to talk about tonight, I serve on the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, and I serve on the Subcommittee on Federal Work Force, U.S. Postal Service and the Census.

Now, I have to admit, when I first was assigned to this subcommittee I thought to myself, what does this committee do, and why am I on it?

And then I began to look into it, and I began to see what it actually works toward, and what are the things that are under its jurisdiction, whether it be the Federal work force and the issues involved there, or it's the Postal Service, which affects every American, or the census. Yes, the census.

One small thing that we spend money on is actually a pretty big thing. It's a decennial census. Using inflation-adjusted dollars, the cost of the census that the government administers every 10 years has risen over 600 percent since 1970.

If you look at this chart right here, you can see, since 1970, see the growth that has happened in the cost of the census. The census cost just \$17 per household in 1970, but it's almost doubled in cost every 10 years, to the point that the 2010 census cost \$115 for every household in America.

Now, I'm going to stop right here for just a second. And I'm sure that maybe if you are tuning in tonight you're going to say, maybe you would ask if you're watching this on another medium, and I'm sure a lot of you are asking right now, why is DOUG COLLINS on the floor talking about the census?

I'm here because the census is a great example of how we can start to save taxpayer money by reforming the small things.

This government has a spending problem. We spend money on more agencies and bureaus than most Americans can possibly comprehend. All these pieces add up to budget problems that we face today. And if we don't start fixing the small pieces now, how will we ever begin to address the big ones?

We spent almost \$15 billion on the census in 2010, \$15 billion. And if we don't start planning now, some projections indicate we could spend as much as \$25 billion in 2020, \$25 billion in 2020, a little over 10 years, we're again adding 10, and some estimates think it could go as high as \$30 billion.

In a subcommittee of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee last week, we heard from the new Director of the Census Bureau about steps that can be taken to keep these costs from going up.

However, the National Academy of Sciences has stated that it is possible that the 2020 census could cost even less than the 2010 version. With the technological developments that have taken place over the last decade, we now have the ability to utilize the Internet and mobile devices in ways that can dramatically cut costs.

We know that the younger generation of Americans is the most difficult to obtain responses from when the census is issued. They're mobile, they're busy, and they just have no interest in filling out surveys with a pencil and paper and mailing it back.

They are much more comfortable using the Internet than any previous generations. They're digital natives. It comes natural to them.

Luckily, we have the ability to utilize the Internet for responses in 2020. We already allow individuals to file their income tax returns online. Implementing an online option for the census is a no-brainer. Instead of sending out multiple mailings, and sending an hourly worker to gather the data, the Census Bureau can use a secure online survey.

This also cuts down on the time it would take for someone to transcribe a written response into an electronic record. Both of these measures have the potential to cut labor costs and, most importantly, to save taxpayer money.

Another way that we can encourage people to take part in the census is through incentives. At a cost of over \$100 per household, we need to consider creating incentives to reduce follow-up responses.

Improving the initial response rate by just 1 percent saves \$85 million in taxpayer money. Remember, taxpayer money. It's a word thrown around up here in Washington a lot, but let's just make it very simple: taxpayer money is what's in your wallet right now. That is all that we have to run on, unless we're borrowing it or printing it.

We need to remember where our money comes from and why it's important to save it.

Whether it is through a small targeted incentive, or a partnership with a local school or community, or something that we have not even thought of yet, beginning these discussions now will prepare us to implement them in time for the 2020 census.

This is important because many of you say it's still several years away. But I'm often amazed, as when I was pastoring, I used to talk to people all the time who would find themselves in March and April, and they could not understand why they were in debt.

And I would often hear them make this statement. They made the statement that, you know, Christmas and the holidays just snuck up on me this year. And I'd think to myself, it's the same time every year. How did it sneak up on you?

And in 10 years, we do the census every year. Why aren't we putting our thought into it now?

And I'm glad to see that our committee is doing that.

When we heard from the Census Bureau at a hearing, we also learned that some of the built-in costs of the census come from needing to ask questions requested by congressional committees. We have the power to add questions, but we should also consider using that same power to remove some.

Every question asked on the census adds more cost to the process and requires taxpayer funding.

I hear from constituents often that the census and the American Community Survey are too long and too intrusive. While we can debate this issue at another time, there is no doubt that we should consider the cost-saving potentials of revisiting these questions asked because people do not have time to fill out long surveys that they find too intrusive and too over-the-top and too overbearing, accompanied with that famous, If you don't fill it out, you're under a penalty of criminal law.

We've got to get back to what really matters. And one of the things is saving money and time.

Another area of savings we should be looking into is technology based on mapping software. As anyone who has had a smartphone really can attest, the mapping technology in a small device is truly remarkable.

A significant cost that adds to the census is when surveyors drive their cars through urban and suburban areas and then have to get out and walk to individual houses.

Oftentimes they have to deal with traffic, depending on the time of day or the part of town that they may be in. As mapping technology is evolving, we now have the ability to minimize the amount of time census employees spend in traffic.

We have seen this technology in action in the private sector. You would expect the private sector to know how to save money and to earn the profit. That's exactly what they're in business to do.

A company like UPS has been able to develop software that optimizes the efficiency of their employees so that

they take as few left turns as possible. A driver might make three right turns to avoid making a left turn.

While this seems counterintuitive, they found that it actually saves money. The employees spend less time sitting at traffic lights and are able to service more households per day. If the census can employ a mobile technology along these same lines, the bureau has the ability to save taxpayer dollars.

Now, understand something: none of these cost-saving measures are truly revolutionary. None of them will shock people or cause a partisan divide. I doubt that our offices will be flooded with constituent calls asking us to adopt them.

But simply put, they're all common-sense measures that will save taxpayer money. The ideas have worked in other areas of government, and have worked in the private sector.

Sometimes it doesn't take a revolutionary idea to be a good one. It often takes a group of leaders deciding to focus on an issue and keep pushing it until the process improves. We have a chance to improve the census and to rein in the costs.

As previously stated, we have the ability to save \$10 billion in future taxpayer cost. As I said earlier, the big things will always work themselves out. We can even run from crisis to crisis up here, and people will focus on the big things, and we will continue to work on those because they matter.

But it's time we gave some consideration to the small things. When we add the small pieces together, we start to actually reduce the deficit and get this country back on solid financial ground.

This is not a small thing. This is what matters to the people back home. This is what matters when they come up to me in the grocery store and they talk about Washington being broken. They want to know how it affects them at their table, at their homes, and with their families.

When we start focusing on the small things, the big things get in perspective even clearer, and we're up here doing exactly what we are supposed to be. And the Republican majority is focused on limited government, focusing on jobs, and getting America back to work again with a government that does what it's supposed to do and gets out of the way.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I thank you for allowing me to speak on this subject tonight, and I yield back the balance of my time.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 687, SOUTHEAST ARIZONA LAND EXCHANGE AND CONSERVATION ACT OF 2013; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1256, RESTORING HEALTHY FORESTS FOR HEALTHY COMMUNITIES ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3102, NUTRITION REFORM AND WORK OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 2013; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. COLE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113-215) on the resolution (H. Res. 351) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 687) to facilitate the efficient extraction of mineral resources in southeast Arizona by authorizing and directing an exchange of Federal and non-Federal land, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1526) to restore employment and educational opportunities in, and improve the economic stability of, counties containing National Forest System land, while also reducing Forest Service management costs, by ensuring that such counties have a dependable source of revenue from National Forest System land, to provide a temporary extension of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000, and for other purposes; providing for consideration for the Bill (H.R. 3102) to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, and for other purposes; and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE JOINT RESOLUTION, H.J. RES. 59 CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

Mr. COLE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113-216) on the resolution (H. Res. 352) providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

□ 2115

REVIEWING THE BASICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY) for 30 minutes.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, this morning, I met with a group of Nebraskans, as we do every week. It's called the Nebraska Breakfast. It's about a 70-year tradition that we have here in the Congress where the House Members and the Senators get together. We've been doing that decade after decade. It's a wonderful way to welcome people to Washington and one of the highlights of our week. What we

do as a delegation is talk about the issues of the day and hear from our constituents as well.

This morning, Mr. Speaker, I thought it might be important to just review a few basics. Some of the terminology and some of the language that we throw around here with great ease is often, I think, disconnected from people out there in the country—words and phrases like continuing resolutions; the Affordable Care Act, known as ObamaCare; sequestration, and debt limits. The reason that I point all this out is there is a convergence of all of these factors right now that is creating the great debate and this moment of drama in the United States Congress.

So let's take those one at a time.

First of all, the continuing resolution. What does that mean? Well, each year, if it worked in an ideal fashion and a proper fashion, the President submits a budget to Congress. Congress can take that budget up or not. The House passes a budget. The Senate passes its own budget. The two are reconciled. We set a budgetary goal, and then the appropriations committees go to work on various aspects of funding the government, whether that's the Defense Department, military services, labor and health and human services, transportation, financial, agriculture support, and the rest of the so-called appropriations bills. Basically, the budget sets up a fence and then the appropriations bills divide up how that money is to be spent each year. That, again, is in an ideal world, which has become very broken of late.

When Congress cannot seem to get a budget agreement between the House and Senate, we come to the end of the fiscal year, which ends this September, and we have to figure out a way to fund the government going forward or else it shuts down. When the government shuts down, there is the potential for planes not to fly, trains not to run, and veterans not to get their services. It's not a proper way to govern. It's not good for the country to have this uncertainty looming out there. We want to do everything we can to try to avoid a government shutdown while moving forward on fiscally responsible policies that return us to what we call "regular order" here and try to get back in place a system of governance that gives some proper planning horizons for the communities at large out there across America and brings it back into an orderly process here.

So if we are not able to pass a budget, the continuing resolution is a vote by both the Senate and the House as to how to move forward either in a temporary fashion or a long-term fashion based upon what current government policies are.

The frustration here is that each year of late we've been going through all of these difficult decisionmaking

processes, particularly through the appropriations process, about which programs are important, which are necessary public policies to help bring essential services to the American people, and which programs are older, antiquated, no longer effective and should either be reduced or eliminated.

We've gone through a number of those processes this year; but because of the disagreements between the two bodies, because of the deep philosophical divide in this Chamber, we have not been able to find a resolution that gets us to what we call regular order—passing appropriations bills under a budgetary framework. So now we are faced with a continuing resolution—the decision as to how to fund the government, moving forward, either for a short term—a month or 2, maybe a few weeks, or even a few days—or long term.

The continuing resolution means we just pick up government where it is and move it forward, basically spending the same amount of money that we did last year and not getting any of the reforms. So it might come to that, but that's an unfortunate way to govern. And I know it's adding cynicism, Mr. Speaker, in the American people's perspective as they watch this deep philosophical divide play itself out on the House floor and seemingly not being able to get anything constructively decided.

Mr. Speaker, I'm from Nebraska. We have a saying, Let's get 'er done. I think that's what most Americans want. Let's find a constructive way, a proper and balanced way, to appropriately reduce spending in areas that are necessary to do so, perhaps even the right type of tax reform to get this fiscal house in order.

Now why is this important? Well, we have a \$600-plus billion deficit this year. Year after year, because we've had these deficits, we've piled up debt. There's now \$17 trillion of debt. By some measures, it's approximating the size of the output of the entire economy. It's a real red flag.

That's why it is so imperative that this body strive to work together, again, in a constructive manner, to figure out the right type of spending and tax policies that deliver essential services, reduce the overspending, increase accountability in effective and smart government and delivery of policy, while also having a fairer and simpler Tax Code. That should be the objective, and I think it is for most Members here. But, unfortunately, the system is working very dysfunctionally at the moment and we're going to be faced with eleventh-hour decisions as to how to fund the government in the short term so that it doesn't shut down. That's called the continuing resolution.

Complicating that this year is the whole debate about the future of health care in America. A couple of years ago, the Affordable Care Act was passed. I did not support it. It's now known as

ObamaCare. We do need the right type of health care reform in our country—a health care reform that is going to improve health care outcomes while reducing costs. I think most Americans are beginning to see and realize this now because it's hitting them and it's hurting them. Instead, what we have in the new health care bill is a shift to more unsustainable costs and an erosion of health care liberties, and a significant amount of Americans are experiencing not affordable care but an escalating cost of their premiums.

Now, there's some components of the health care law that I think are reasonable; and as we move forward, we should retain them, such as keeping kids on health insurance up to the age of 26. I supported that policy before the health care bill. Removing caps on health insurance in case a family would cap out, that doesn't save the system any money. The family simply has to go find another job and an insurance provider, creating great duress. That doesn't make sense. Appropriately dealing with the problem of preexisting conditions. There have been a number of Americans who were priced out of the insurance market, who could not find affordable, quality insurance. And that's a real crack in our market system, so that it's necessary that public policy deal with that.

But what we've gotten instead is a massive turning over of our entire health care system. It's creating havoc. Prices are going up. People aren't sure as to whether or not they can keep their doctor or their health care plan. Some people are experiencing unemployment as companies either don't expand or have to reduce numbers because they want to get under the threshold by which they have to provide health insurance for their employees. And some employees are having reduced hours. This is a very big problem.

Another component of this is that the President and the administration have exempted certain entities. Recently, the implementation of the business demand that they provide health care has been delayed. It's really not fair because individuals are saying, if you can delay the business mandate, the corporate mandate, why not the individual mandate?

The fullness of ObamaCare, the Affordable Care Act, is coming into full force very shortly. So this is colliding as well with our budgetary discussion, and it's creating dramatic dynamics as we end the month here at the end of the fiscal year.

The other aspect of this is called sequestration. A couple of years ago, we were in a very similar situation in which we were faced with raising the debt ceiling—and I'll return to that Washington phrase in a moment—or not. A special committee was set up to review the Tax Code and to review spending, and they were going to come up with a process by which there was a

fair and balanced approach to spending and taxes going forward.

But that supercommittee failed. The incentive for them to act in a constructive manner was something called "sequestration," which is the implementation of automatic budget cuts, primarily affecting the defense of our country, and what we call nondefense discretionary spending.

Nondefense discretionary spending is basically everything else the government does, other than the defense and veterans and retirement and health security programs—basically, Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. So a third of the entire budget is what is being affected by sequestration, and many Members of Congress have seen the furloughs in their districts and cutbacks on vital programs.

I think there's widespread support, particularly where I come from, on, again, ensuring that we have the right type of spending reductions while there is also a proper delivery of important essentials. We have to do this in a smart manner. The sequestration does it across the board. It's a very clumsy, awkward way to do this. It's not judicious. It's not using discretion. It's not taking the best judgment through our normal processes of considering a budget and appropriations bills and saying, that program may have been good at one time, but it no longer fits modern needs. Let's get rid of it and save that money and bring down spending or apply it to something new that's innovative that can really help people.

That's what sequestration is doing. That's what it did this year. Because that supercommittee failed to meet its goal, there were automatic budgetary reductions put in place. They will continue unless, again, we can come to an agreement as to how we replace sequestration with a more prudent form of spending reduction that would hopefully be coupled, again, with the right type of tax reform.

Let me talk about that fourth Washington phrase, those two words, the "debt ceiling." We used to never hear much about this. The debt ceiling was something that kind of came and went. Congress has to give the authority to the President to go out and borrow money. Usually, that was automatic; but because our debt has gotten so large, so severe, at \$17 trillion, most Members of Congress are saying this is so severe that it demands creative thinking and bold resolve, or else we will undermine not only our economic well-being but also national security.

Now, how so? What does \$17 trillion of debt mean?

Mr. Speaker, we are a people that self-governs. This debt is not sitting out there as somebody else's problem. It's America's problem. So if you divided it all up between every man, woman, and child in this country, every one of us would have to write a check for \$53,000 in order to pay off the current debt.

Now, that doesn't even consider the projection of debt in the future based

upon the way in which current spending programs are constructed. If we take the present value of the future obligations of programs as they are now written, the debt would so accelerate that each person in America right now, if nothing changes, would owe \$300,000.

Mr. Speaker, I have five children. There are seven of us in the family. Obviously, I can't afford a check to the government for \$2.1 million to take care of my share of this obligation; nor can most Americans. Something has to change. It will take bold resolve and constructive commitment to fair and balanced outcomes both on the spending side as well as the Tax Code ledger side.

If we don't do this, Mr. Speaker, what are the consequences if we don't deal with this debt successfully? By the way, it can't be done overnight. It's too big. That would be too disruptive to do it overnight. But we have to set a pathway in which we are committed to seriously reducing this debt and getting the fiscal house in order, turning this battleship around.

The consequences are really threefold if we don't. First of all, it's a form of future taxation. We're forcing the children of the future to pay for the way in which we're living now. It's fundamentally unjust, unfair.

Secondly, a lot of this high level of debt is held by foreign countries such as China. What does that mean? That is a shift of the assets of this country—what we own—into the hands of other people. We get all worried that China is undertaking a military expansion. We've sent a heck of a lot of manufacturing over there, sent a lot of our economy over there. They make the stuff; we buy the stuff. They have the cash. We run up debt; they buy our debt.

□ 1930

It's a very dysfunctional marriage. But the consequences are, over time, that is a shift of what we own in this country into the hands of a place like China.

And where does that money go? Well, there is a ruling elite that's doing pretty well there. There's a hybrid communist-capitalistic system that doesn't seem to be very interested in the notion of private property rights and human rights, doesn't seem to be advancing very fast in this regard.

So this economic liberalization, you would hope, over time would help bring about the focus on fundamental human rights and human dignity. But it has certainly empowered a wealthy elite, and it's being plowed back into military infrastructure buildup.

So our debt is a national security problem. Because we hear that the Chinese, for instance, are expanding their navy, expanding their nuclear arsenal. So what is our response? We'll send more ships into the Pacific.

Well, Mr. Speaker, there is also a response that needs to be had and that we need to work diligently and quickly

and boldly with clear resolve, ideally in a bipartisan manner because this is an American problem. This really isn't about politics, Mr. Speaker. This is about principle. This is about participation in the future welfare of our country, regaining our balance, regaining our strength. This should transcend the partisan political divide. We'll have a big debate about, again, what are the appropriate areas to reduce and what's the right type of tax balance. Fine. But we should all be committed to getting to this goal to quickly reverse this trend, which has severe economic and national security consequences.

The third problem with all this debt is it's potentially inflationary. Now, we have a very expansive liquidity policy going on right now, basically buying up our debt. The consequences over time could be a further unleashing of inflationary impacts, which is a form of taxation, a regressive form of taxation. It hits the poor the hardest, those who are on fixed incomes, seniors the hardest. It is grossly unfair. People who are not in a position in life to adjust prices, if you will, and so that creates a further form of taxation on those who are least able to handle it.

So this is why, Mr. Speaker, this debt problem is so severe. We're bumping up in the near term against this debt ceiling limit. Now, again, what does that mean?

Congress has to give the administration authority to borrow more money. Now, the last time we did this, we actually reduced spending by more than an amount that we borrowed. That was the plan, again, trying to get to this in a manner that is not disruptive but actually begins to reduce the spending in a necessary fashion by more than the amount that we continue to borrow. It's a slow walk toward a better situation.

We may end up there now, I don't know, but this is one of these dynamics that's sitting out there, along with the continuing resolution, the future of health care in this country, called ObamaCare, the sequestration, dealing with these automatic cuts if we don't figure out a constructive way to budget and to appropriate. And then the debt ceiling, in which we have to have a plan to basically continue to pull down this very, very large burdensome debt and all of its economic as well as national security consequences. Mr. Speaker, we must do this, and we must do it now.

So I would urge all of my colleagues, let's transcend the partisan divide here. We're going to have differences. We all come from districts with particular perspectives. We have different philosophical ideas as to how to approach government. Some people want more investment at the Federal level. Those of us who believe in the sole principle called subsidiarity, where those closest to a problem or opportunity should be empowered to solve the problem or seize the opportunity—Federalism, as it used to be known.

That has been the robust way in which America gained such economic prowess in the world and was a leader and continues to be a leader for so many people who desire the nature of a system like ours that is rooted in this cultural ideal that each person has inherent dignity and rights and also has responsibility—even responsibility—for government.

So, Mr. Speaker, we're going to have quite a bit of drama, I'm afraid, in the coming days and weeks. Let's hope it doesn't add cynicism to the deepening cynicism toward our institution. People in America have entrusted us to represent them, to make judgments on their behalf. I think most people in America want something constructive done, something that's fair, that's not done in an emergency, 11th-hour scenario, that doesn't disrupt economic well-being because it's either too dramatic or too harsh or done at the last minute, that takes a little bit longer view, gets past the politics of the moment and takes a longer view as to what's right and good for America.

Mr. Speaker, the people who came behind us, who sacrificed so much to build what we have, don't they deserve our best? Don't they deserve a commitment to these higher ideals? Because our economic well-being is tied to our ability to work constructively and creatively together to get this fiscal house together, to get it on the right track, to appropriately reduce spending while also delivering smart public policies that are effective in helping people across this country, that revitalizes our economic strength, that takes the duress off of communities where people can't find jobs and can't find work, that creates a fairer Tax Code that's less convoluted, that's a little bit simpler, where you don't have to have an army of lawyers and accountants to figure out ways around it. That's what we ought to be focused on. That's what we need to get done. That's what I think our people are demanding from us.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to share these thoughts with you and my colleagues.

I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. RUSH (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for September 12 until September 20 on account of attending to family acute medical care and hospitalization.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 19, 2013, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2995. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the OMB Sequestration Update Report to the President and Congress for fiscal year 2014, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 902(d)(2); to the Committee on Appropriations.

2996. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of 21 officers to wear the authorized insignia of the grade of brigadier general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2997. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Colonel David G. Bellon to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2998. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral James P. Wisecup, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2999. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of the Treasury, transmitting A report with regard to the Treasury's agenda with regard to the international financial institutions; to the Committee on Financial Services.

3000. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Student Assistance General Provisions (RIN: 1880-AA87) received September 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

3001. A letter from the General Counsel, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Paying Benefits received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

3002. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting report prepared by the Department of State concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3003. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel, Department of the Treasury, transmitting three reports pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3004. A letter from the Deputy Chief, National Forest System, Department of the Interior, transmitting copies of the detailed boundaries for the Roaring Wild and Scenic River and the Sandy Wild and Scenic River, Upper Portion, in Oregon; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3005. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Endangered Species Listing, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Designation of Critical Habitat for the Austin Blind and Jollyville Plateau Salamanders [Docket No.: FWS-R2-ES-2013-0001; 4500030113] (RIN: 1018-AZ24) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3006. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Endangered Species Listing, Department of the

Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Determination of Endangered Status for Texas Golden Gladdess and Threatened Status for Neches River Rose-mallow [Docket No.: FWS-R2-ES-2010-0064] (RIN: 1018-AX74) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3007. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Endangered Species Listing, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Designation of Critical Habitat for Texas Golden Gladdess and Neches River Rose-mallow [Docket No.: FWS-R2-ES-2013-0027, 4500030113] (RIN: 1018-AZ49) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3008. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Highly Migratory Species; 2006 Consolidated Atlantic Highly Migratory Species Fishery Management Plan; Amendment 8 [Docket No.: 12062194-3957-02] (RIN: 0648-BC31) received September 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3009. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Reef Fish Fishery of Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands; Parrotfish Management Measures in St. Croix [Docket No.: 120510052-3615-02] (RIN: 0648-BC20) received September 3, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3010. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Ocean Perch in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 121018563-3148-02] (RIN: 0648-XC757) received September 3, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3011. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Western Pacific Fisheries; 2013 Annual Catch Limits and Accountability Measures; Correcting Amendment [Docket No.: 121107617-3628-03] (RIN: 0648-XC351) received September 3, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3012. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Snapper-Grouper Fishery Off the South Atlantic States; Regulatory Amendment 18 [Docket No.: 130312235-3658-02] (RIN: 0648-BD04) received September 3, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3013. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Northern Rockfish in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 120918468-3111-02] (RIN: 0348-XC769) received September 3, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3014. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries,

NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder Fishery; Commercial Quota Harvested for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts [Docket No.: 111220786-1781-01] (RIN: 0648-XC811) received September 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3015. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Snapper-Grouper Fishery Off the South Atlantic States; Regulatory Amendment 15 [Docket No.: 120924488-3671-02] (RIN: 0648-BC60) received September 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3016. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States; Modifications of the West Coast Commercial Salmon Fisheries; Inseason Actions #6 Through #11 [Docket No.: 130108020-3409-01] (RIN: 0648-XC738) received September 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3017. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries [Docket No.: 130214139-3542-02] (RIN: 0648-XC789) received September 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3018. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule — Visas: Documentation of Non-immigrants — Visa Classification; T Visa Class (RIN: 1400-AD42) received September 3, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3019. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting The Report to Congress on the Application of Electronic Health Records (EHR) Payment Incentives for Providers Not Receiving Other Incentive Payments; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

3020. A letter from the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction, transmitting the SIGIR's final report to Congress; jointly to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Appropriations.

3021. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of the Treasury, transmitting A report covering the operation and status of the relevant federal fund accounts; jointly to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON
PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules, House Resolution 351. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 687) to facilitate the efficient extraction of mineral resources in southeast Arizona by authorizing and directing an exchange of Federal and non-Federal land, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill

(H.R. 1526) to restore employment and educational opportunities in, and improve the economic stability of, counties containing National Forest System land, while also reducing Forest Service management costs, by ensuring that such counties have a dependable source of revenue from National Forest system land, to provide a temporary extension of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3102) to amend the Food and Nutrition Act 2008; and for other purposes (Rept. 113-215). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 352. Resolution providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules (Rept. 113-216). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. PAULSEN (for himself, Mr. LANCE, Mr. REED, and Mr. KLINE):

H.R. 3119. A bill to prohibit enrollment under Health Care Exchange plans until privacy protections are certified as being in place, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CUMMINGS (for himself and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 3120. A bill to improve access to oral health care for vulnerable and underserved populations; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, the Judiciary, Natural Resources, Veterans' Affairs, and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. SCALISE, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. FLORES, Mr. PEARCE, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. ROSS, Mr. STEWART, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. BUCHON, Mr. COTTON, Mr. JORDAN, and Mr. SALMON):

H.R. 3121. A bill to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and related reconciliation provisions, to promote patient-centered health care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Education and the Workforce, the Judiciary, Natural Resources, House Administration, Appropriations, and Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 3122. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to promote student physical health and well-being, nutrition, and fitness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana (for himself, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 3123. A bill to ensure prompt access to Supplemental Security Income, Social Security disability, and Medicaid benefits for persons released from certain public institutions; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 3124. A bill to amend part E of title IV of the Social Security Act to extend the adoption incentive payments program to incentive payments for foster child exits to reunification, adoption, and guardianship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENYART:

H.R. 3125. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to make competitive grants to support research and development, education, and training to produce a bio-based aviation fuel for use by the Air Force and to provide an initial infusion of funds for the grant program; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FINCHER:

H.R. 3126. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to prohibit a government subsidy for the purchase of a health plan by a Member of Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MAFFEI:

H.R. 3127. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit to small employers for certain newly hired employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Small Business, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MATSUI:

H.R. 3128. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide additional penalties applicable to psychiatric hospitals and units that fail to comply with Medicare discharge planning process requirements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. MOORE:

H.R. 3129. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the full exclusion applicable to qualified small business stock; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD:

H.R. 3130. A bill to establish humane practices for the repatriation of aliens at the border, establish effective standards for the treatment of certain aliens in the custody of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SABLON (for himself, Ms. GABBARD, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. HOLT):

H.R. 3131. A bill to authorize studies of certain areas for possible inclusion in the National Park System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. TERRY:

H.R. 3132. A bill to ensure orderly conduct of Nuclear Regulatory Commission actions; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ADERHOLT:

H. Con. Res. 56. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that a certain lock and dam should be known and designated as the "Donald G. Waldon Lock and Dam"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BECERRA:

H. Res. 349. A resolution electing a Member to a certain standing committee of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. ROKITA:

H. Res. 350. A resolution establishing a select committee to investigate and report on the surveillance operations of the National Security Agency; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

137. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Florida, relative to Senate Memorial No. 1266 urging the President and the Congress to award the United States 65th Infantry Regiment, the Borinqueneers, the Congressional Gold Medal; to the Committee on Financial Services.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 3119.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. CUMMINGS:

H.R. 3120.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1: "The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States"

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee:

H.R. 3121.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1, with respect to the power to "lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises," and to provide for the "general Welfare of the United States."

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution gives Congress the power to "regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes."

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution, which gives Congress the power to "make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

This legislation puts forth measures relating to the treatment of existing commerce

and the exchange of health care products, services, and transactions, while retaining the sovereignty and power of respective states as outlined in Amendment X of the U.S. Constitution. The legislation also makes amendments to the manner in which the United States defines and enacts certain taxes, as implemented through the power to collect taxes and provide for the general Welfare.

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution provides for those provisions which serve as a means to secure the ends of Clauses 1 and 3 of Article 1, Section 8, as cited above. Such provisions, include, but are not limited to eligibility standards, reporting measures relating to the practical implementation of tax provisions, and instructions specifying the relationship among existing Departments and programs.

Nothing in this legislation shall be construed to restrict due process of the law as defined in Section 1, Amendment XIV of the U.S. Constitution.

This legislation includes a provision to repeal Public Law 111-148 and title I and subtitle B of title II of Public Law 111-152, which exceeds the scope of power vested in Congress by the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 3122.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:

H.R. 3123.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 3124.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. ENYART:

H.R. 3125.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. FINCHER:

H.R. 3126.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8.

By Mr. MAFFEI:

H.R. 3127.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 and Clause 18 of Section 8, of Article 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. MATSUI:

H.R. 3128.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Ms. MOORE:

H.R. 3129.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8:

Congress has the power to lay and collect taxes.

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD:

H.R. 3130.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. SABLAN:

H.R. 3131.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, section 8, clause 3 and Article IV, section 3, clause 2 of the Constitution.

By Mr. TERRY:

H.R. 3132.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. I, Sec. 8, Cl. 3

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 241: Mr. LAMALFA.
H.R. 358: Mr. ROTHFUS.
H.R. 419: Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 437: Mr. ISRAEL and Mr. DOYLE.
H.R. 485: Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 508: Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 541: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 543: Mr. HONDA and Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 679: Ms. GABBARD.
H.R. 685: Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. BOUSTANY, and Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 705: Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. MESSER, Mr. OLSON, and Ms. JENKINS.
H.R. 763: Mrs. LUMMIS and Mr. WOODALL.
H.R. 797: Mr. HINOJOSA.
H.R. 809: Mr. CARNEY.
H.R. 901: Mr. LATHAM and Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 904: Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. HURT, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 911: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.
H.R. 920: Mr. SMITH of Missouri and Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
H.R. 924: Ms. KUSTER and Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 938: Mr. HECK of Washington.
H.R. 975: Mrs. BEATTY and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 1015: Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mrs. ROBY, and Ms. SCHWARTZ.
H.R. 1020: Mr. DELANEY and Mr. SABLAN.
H.R. 1024: Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 1077: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. SMITH of Texas.
H.R. 1098: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 1146: Mrs. WALORSKI and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 1176: Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 1317: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
H.R. 1318: Mr. WAXMAN.
H.R. 1326: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 1354: Mr. TIBERI, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. PETERS of California.
H.R. 1461: Mr. GOHMERT and Mr. CARTER.
H.R. 1507: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. WATERS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. JOYCE, and Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 1518: Mr. JOYCE.
H.R. 1553: Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. WOODALL, and Mr. GIBSON.
H.R. 1573: Mr. ISRAEL and Mr. COOPER.
H.R. 1588: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 1628: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H.R. 1658: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. HANABUSA, and Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 1666: Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. POCAN, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. O'ROURKE.
H.R. 1701: Mr. MASSIE.
H.R. 1717: Mrs. WALORSKI.
H.R. 1726: Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. FARR, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mr.

FALEOMAVAEGA, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 1752: Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 1761: Mr. RUSH, Mr. HECK of Nevada, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 1771: Mr. GARRETT.

H.R. 1787: Mr. WALZ, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, and Mr. HARPER.

H.R. 1798: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 1801: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 1844: Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. DEFazio, and Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 1846: Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 1852: Mr. POCAN and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 1861: Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 1878: Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, and Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 1884: Ms. SPEIER, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. KILMER, Mr. MAFFEI, Ms. ESTY, Mr. CARNEY, and Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 1920: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 1971: Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 1985: Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 1999: Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 2003: Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 2019: Mr. MCCARTHY of California.

H.R. 2041: Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 2053: Mr. SIMPSON.

H.R. 2101: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 2134: Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 2146: Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. COURTNEY, and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.

H.R. 2199: Ms. CASTOR of Florida and Mr. JONES.

H.R. 2247: Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, and Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 2249: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. TIERNEY, and Mr. WOLF.

H.R. 2296: Mr. KILMER and Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 2302: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 2315: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2330: Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 2399: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 2415: Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BARLETTA, and Mr. MATHESON.

H.R. 2500: Ms. GRANGER and Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 2502: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 2523: Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 2548: Mr. ROSKAM and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 2553: Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. FOSTER, and Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 2575: Mrs. BACHMANN.

H.R. 2619: Mr. KILMER and Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 2638: Mr. HANNA.

H.R. 2654: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 2663: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.

H.R. 2692: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.

H.R. 2717: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 2725: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 2738: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 2744: Mr. ROSKAM.

H.R. 2772: Mr. LARSEN of Washington and Mr. MEEKS.

H.R. 2780: Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. KILMER, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. ELLISON, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. DELAUBRO, Mr. YARMUTH, and Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 2782: Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 2785: Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 2790: Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. PETERSON, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 2801: Mr. WALZ, Mr. LATHAM, and Mr. SIMPSON.

H.R. 2805: Mr. ROSKAM.

H.R. 2809: Mr. LONG, Mr. MESSER, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. SALMON, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. ROSS, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. POSEY, Mr. BARTON, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. MARINO.

H.R. 2810: Mr. LATHAM and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 2822: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
 H.R. 2841: Ms. MOORE and Ms. HANABUSA.
 H.R. 2908: Mr. LONG.
 H.R. 2936: Ms. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 2943: Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. FORBES.
 H.R. 2952: Ms. CLARKE.
 H.R. 2957: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. ENYART, Mr. KLINE, and Mr. QUIGLEY.
 H.R. 2998: Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 3005: Ms. ESHOO.
 H.R. 3040: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
 H.R. 3076: Mr. BOUSTANY and Mr. ROKITA.
 H.R. 3077: Mr. LONG.
 H.R. 3082: Mr. STOCKMAN.
 H.R. 3089: Mr. WITTMAN.
 H.R. 3093: Mr. DESANTIS.
 H.R. 3095: Mr. COBLE, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. NOLAN, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. WALZ, Mr. WALBERG, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
 H.R. 3098: Mr. RUIZ.
 H.R. 3103: Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. ROONEY, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. JONES, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.
 H.R. 3106: Mrs. WALORSKI.
 H.R. 3108: Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MOORE, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. NADLER, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. CONNOLLY,

Mr. CLAY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. RUSH, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. SERRANO.
 H.R. 3116: Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. BUCSHON, and Mr. CRENSHAW.
 H.J. Res. 34: Mr. CLEAVER.
 H.J. Res. 43: Ms. BONAMICI and Mr. ISRAEL.
 H.J. Res. 62: Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. POSEY, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. LATTA.
 H. Res. 35: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
 H. Res. 63: Mr. TIERNEY and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
 H. Res. 109: Mr. LUETKEMEYER and Mr. SCHRADER.
 H. Res. 208: Ms. CHU and Mr. SCHIFF.
 H. Res. 254: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. MORAN, and Ms. DELBENE.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The amendment to be offered by Representative RAÚL M. GRIJALVA, or a designee, to H.R. 687 the Southeast Arizona Land Exchange and Conservation Act of 2013 does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited

tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of Rule XXI.

The amendment number 1 to be offered by Representative DAINES, or a designee, to H.R. 1526, the Restoring Healthy Forests for Healthy Communities Act does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. RYAN OF WISCONSIN

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on the Budget in H.J. Res. 59, the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014, do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

49. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Town of Millbury, Massachusetts, relative to Warrant Article No. 7 urging the Congress to enact H.R. 129; to the Committee on Financial Services.

50. Also, a petition of the City of Kenosha, Wisconsin, relative to Resolution No. 113-13 urging the passage of a constitutional amendment reclaiming democracy from the corrupting effects of undue corporate influence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.